This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Per. 3977 d. $\frac{41}{26}$

THE

NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

EDITED BY

EDWARD I. SEARS, LL.D.

Pulchrum est bene facere reipublicæ, etiam bene dicere haud absurdum est.

VOL. XXVI. NOS. FOR DECEMBER, 1872, AND MARCH, 1873.

NEW YORK:
EDWARD I. SEARS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,
1873.

Entered, according to act of Congress, in the year 1873, by
EDWARD I. SEARS,
In the office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington.

CONTENTS OF NO. LI.

ART. PAGE

I. SIAM AND THE SIAMESE 1

1. *Travels in the Central Parts of Indo-China (Siam), Cambodia, and Laos, during the Years* 1858, 1859 *and* 1860. By the late M. HENRI MOUHAT, French Naturalist. 2 vols., with Illustrations. London. 1864.

2. *The Modern Buddhist; being the Views of a Siamese Minister of State, on his own and other Religions.* Translated, with remarks, by HENRY ALABASTER, Interpreter of H. B. M. Consulate-General in Siam. London. 1870.

3. *The English Governess at the Siamese Court; being Recollections of Six Years in the Royal Palace at Bangkok.* By ANNA HARRIETTE LEONOWENS, with Illustrations from Photographs presented to the Author by the King of Siam. London. 1871.

II. NOTABILITIES OF THE AMERICAN BAR—RUFUS CHOATE . 26

1. *The Life and Writings of* RUFUS CHOATE. By SAMUEL GILMAN BROWN, Professor in Dartmouth College. Two volumes. 1862. Boston.

ART. PAGE.

2. *Reminiscences of* RUFUS CHOATE, *the Great American Advocate.* By EDWARD G. PARKER. 1860. Boston.

3. *Proceedings of the Bar upon the Death of* RUFUS CHOATE, *in* 1859, *and the Address of Professor* THEOPHILUS PARSONS, *at the Cambridge Law School, upon him as a Lawyer.*

4. *The Speech of* RUFUS CHOATE *in the Dalton Divorce Case; also, The Celebrated Trial of Firrell, the Somnambulist, for Murder.* Pamphlets.

III. THE PUFFING ELEMENT IN AMERICAN LITERATURE . . 42

1. *A Manual of American Literature: A Text-Book for Schools and Colleges.* By JOHN S. HART, LL.D., Professor of Rhetoric and of the English Language and Literature in the College of New Jersey, and late Principal of the New Jersey State Normal School. 12mo, pp. 641. Eldridge & Brother: Philadelphia. 1872.

2. *A Manual of English Literature; A Text-book for Schools and Colleges.* By JOHN S. HART, LL. D., etc., etc., etc. 12mo. pp. 636. Eldridge & Brother: Philadelphia. 1872.

3. *A Hand-book of English Literature.* Intended for the Use of High Schools, as well as a Companion and Guide for Private Students and for General Readers. By FRANCIS H. UNDERWOOD, A.M. *American Authors.* 12mo, pp. 640. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham. 1872.

IV. THE PLANETARY THEORY 67

1. *The Mathematical Principle of Natural Philosophy.* By SIR ISAAC NEWTON. 1 vol. 8vo, New York. 1848.

2. *Theorie Analytique du Système du Monde.* Par G. DE PONTECOULANT. 4 vols. 8vo and Supplement. Paris. 1834—1856.

ART. PAGE
3. *Mathematical Tracts on the Lunar and the Planetary Perturbations.* By GEORGE BIDDELL AIRY. 1 vol. 8vo. Cambridge. 1858.
4. *Memoir on the Secular Variations of the Elements of the Orbits of the Eight Principal Planets, Mercury, Venus, the Earth, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, etc., etc.* By JOHN N. STOCKWELL, M. S., Smithsonian Institute. 1872.

V. THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA AND ITS NEW WINDOWS 88
1. *The University of Pennsylvania. Public Inauguration of the New Building erected for the Department of Art and the Department of Science.* Newspaper Report. Philadelphia. 1872.
2. *University of Pennsylvania. Special Announcement of the Organization and Courses of Study of the New Department of Science.* To be opened September, 1872. Pamphlet. Philadelphia. 1872.

VI. POPE ALEXANDER VI. 105
1. *Historie d'Italie.* Par GUICHARDINI.
2. *Burchardt's Diarium.*
2. *Histoire du Pape Alexandre VI.* Par L'ABBÉ JORRY. Paris. 1851.
4. *Etudes critiques sur l'Histoire d'Alexandre VI.* SAINT BRIENC. 1850.
5. *Histoire des Papes.* Par J. CHANTRELL. Paris. 1862.
6. *Dublin Review,* No. XC, January, 1859. Art. "History in Fiction."

VII. DEVELOPMENT IN ART 132
1. *De la Littérature, Considéré dans ses Rapports avec les Institutions Sociales.* Par MADAME DE STAËL HOLSTEIN. Londres. 1813.
2. *Criticisms on Art.* By WM. HAZLITT. London. 1844.

PAGE. ART.

3. *Voyage en Italie.* Par H. TAINE. Paris. 1866.
4. *Modern Painters.* By JOHN RUSKIN. London. 1860.

VIII. HORACE GREELEY 153
Sketches of the Life and Labors of Horace Greeley. By the Daily Press.

IX. NOTICES AND CRITICISMS 167
Education 166
History and Biography 183
Science and Journalism 193

PPE N D I—INSURANCE TRACTS; BIBLE TRACTS; CLOAKS; RESULTS. 196

CONTENTS OF NO. LII.

ART. PAGE.

I. NORTH AMERICA BEFORE THE SPANISH CONQUEST 211

1. *Examen critique de la Histoire de la Géographie du nouveau Continent.* HUMBOLDT. Paris.

2. *Ancient America in Notes on American Archæology.* By JNO. D. BALDWIN. New York.

3. *Historical and Geographical Notes on the Earliest Discoveries in America,* 1453–1530. By HENRY STEVENS, G. M. B., M. A., etc. 1869.

4. *Quatre Lettres sur le Mexique.* Par M. BRASSEUR de BOURBOURG. Paris. 1868.

II. MOTIVES AND STRUGGLES OF SHAKESPEARE IN SETTLING IN LONDON 234

1. *A Short View of Tragedy; its original excellency and corruption: with some reflections on Shakespeare and other Practitioners for the Stage.* RYMER. 1693.

2. *The Ground of Criticism in Tragedy.* DRYDEN. 1679.

3. *Enquiry into the Learning of Shakespeare.* P. WHALLEY. 1748.

4. *Letters on the Writings and Genius of Shakespeare.* J. DENNIS. 1712.

ART. PAGE.

III. World Wealth 252

1. *Histoire de la Civilisation en Europe.* Par M. Guizot. Paris. 1866.

2. *Survey of Human Progress.* By N. Arnott. London. 1861.

IV. Jean Baptiste De la Salle 275

1. *Vie de* J. B. De la Salle. Par M. Lamy. Paris.

2. *Memoir of the Abbé Lacordaire.* Montalembert.

3. *Œuvres du tres Hon. Frère Philippe.* 1836, 1872.

4. *Les Frères des Ecoles Chretiennes en Amerique.* Rene de Saint Mauris.

5. *L'Etat et ses Limites.* Par Ed. Laboulaye.

6. *Le Prix de Boston.* Paris.

7. *Les Frères à l'Academie.* Paris.

V. Supplement to "The University of Pennsylvania and its New Windows" 305

1. *Commentaries, Critical, Philological and Geographical, in Sundry Newspapers.* By the learned Provost and Faculty of the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: December, January and February, 1873.

2. *A "So-Called Latin Letter," stamped with the Cabalistic or Hieroglyphic initials* N. Q. R., and *long supposed to be the production of an ancient Brahmin, but discovered recently by a learned Graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, after much profound research, to be the work of a spiteful and libellous Savage of the Bog species.* New York: 1871.

3. *An Essay on the Art of Growing Rich by* Degrees, *as practised in the middle of the Nineteenth Century among the people called Quakers, with some Digressions on Natural History, Equipments, Gunnery, Materia Medica,* etc., etc. Manhattan: MDCCCLXXIII.

ART. PAGE.

VI. The Internal and External Fire of the Earth . . . 353

1. *Considerations on Volcanoes.* By G. Poulett Scrope. London, 1825. Last Ed. 1871.

2. *Considerations Generales sur les Volcans.* Par M. J. Girardin. Paris, 1831.

3. *Théorie Mathématique de la Chaleur.* Par M. Poisson. 4to. Paris, 1835–1837.

4. *The Eruption of Vesuvius in* 1872. By Prof. Luigi Palmieri. With Notes, etc.; by *Robert Mallet*, Mem. Inst. C. E., F. R. S., F. G. S., M. R. I. S., etc. With Illustrations. 148 pp. 8vo. London: Asher & Co., 1873.

VII. Notices and Criticisms 382

Education 382
Belles Lettres 392
Philosophy 396
Ornithology 400

VIII. Appendix—Insurance, Good, Bad, and Indifferent, . . 402

THE

NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. LI.

DECEMBER, 1872.

ART. I.—1. *Travels in the Central Parts of Indo-China (Siam), Cambodia, and Laos, during the Years* 1858, 1859 *and* 1860. By the late M. HENRI MOUHAT, French Naturalist. 2 vols., with Illustrations. London. 1864.

2. *The Modern Buddhist; being the Views of a Siamese Minister of State, on his own and other Religions.* Translated, with remarks, by HENRY ALABASTER, Interpreter of H. B. M., Consulate-General in Siam. London. 1870.

3. *The English Governess at the Siamese Court; being Recollections of Six Years in the Royal Palace at Bangkok.* By ANNA HARRIETTE LEONOWENS, with Illustrations from Photographs presented to the Author by the King of Siam. London. 1871.

THE word "Siam" is Malay, from which language this name, as well as many other of Indian places, has been borrowed by Europeans. The Siamese are not acquainted with it; they call their country Thaï, or Monang-Thaï, which means "Free" or "the Kingdom of the Free." I. Baptiste Pallegoix, bishop of Mallos, and head of the Roman Catholic Church in Siam, who resided there more than thirty years, and is, therefore, a great authority in these matters, maintains that the modern name "Siam" is derived from "Sajam," a Malay word signifying "the brown race."[*] It was first known in Europe in the year 1502, through the medium of the Portuguese, who opened intercourse with the Siamese nine years after the conquest of the peninsula of Malacca by Alphonso de Albuquerque. This intercourse, however, was not maintained, owing to the continual wars between Burmah and Siam, and little was known of the country until 1632, when an English vessel touched at the ancient capital, Ayuthia. Shortly after this the Portuguese at Goa sent a party of Dominican and Franciscan missionaries to Siam, and the communication between the two nations became more frequent. The king engaged in his service three hundred Portuguese soldiers; these were distributed over the country, having lands allotted to them for cultivation, and they married native women. The missionaries built two churches and established a school.

Siam was visited in the sixteenth century by the Portuguese explorer, Ferdinand Mendez Pinto, and by the German traveller, Mandelslohe, who designates its capital, Ayuthia, "the Venice of the East." Siam appears to have been originally a great fief of China, and the king of Siam at this day receives from that empire a special confirmation of his authority, much resembling the patronage accorded by the sultan to the Barbary States.[†] Dr. Charles Pickering, of Boston, thinks that the Siamese are Malay,[‡] but upon very insufficient grounds, for he admits that the Siamese twins were the only persons of that nation he ever saw, but adds that they were of the Malay race. Mrs. Leonowens, who resided nearly six years in Siam, thinks that the Siamese are mainly Mongolian.[§] Their physiognomy certainly resembles that of the Tartars more than that of any other race. Their faces are broad and flat, with round, prominent cheek-bones, a small nose obtusely pointed, a large mouth with rather thick lips, black eyes, a low forehead, and very scanty beard, and their hair is always black, thick, coarse and lank. They have a lighter colored skin than the western Asiatics, but darker than the Chinese. The Malay mixture, however, is considerable.

---

[*] Mouhat, *Travels*, vol. 1, p. 60. [†] Ibid.

[‡] *Physical History of Man*, p. 185.

[§] *English Governess*, p. 25. See also Finlayson, *Mission to Siam and Hué*, chap. vi., edited by Sir T. S. Raffles, F.R.S.

The population of Siam has been variously estimated. In 1822 Mr. Crawford set it down at 2,790,000, including foreigners and emigrants of all nations. In 1832, Mr. Roberts, United States minister at Bangkok, calculated that it amounted to 3,620,000. Bishop Pallegoix estimated it at 6,000,000 in 1850; but the translator of *The Modern Buddhist*, a work composed by the Siamese minister of state, Chao Phya Thipahon, better known to foreigners as Chao Phya Praklang, writing in 1870, gives the number of people at 4,000,000 only. The difference arises probably from the latter not including the Chinese, who are found in Siam in great numbers, there being 300,000 of them in Bangkok alone. The Siamese are rigid Buddhists; they are excelled by none in the sincerity of their belief, and the liberality with which they support their religion. No other Buddhist country, of similar extent, can show so many splendid temples and monasteries. In Bangkok alone there are more than one hundred monasteries, and, it is said, ten thousand monks and novices. More than this, every male Siamese, sometime during his life, and generally in the prime of it, takes orders as a monk, and retires for some months or years to practise abstinence and meditation in a monastery.*

The late king of Siam followed this custom, and, while he was a monk, made himself eminent for his knowledge of the Buddhist Scriptures. In fact, he founded a new school of Buddhist thought, and boldly preached against the canonicity of those of them whose relations were opposed to his reason and his knowledge of modern science. His majesty was a man of remarkable genius and acquirements. His powers as a linguist were considerable, and they enabled him to use an English library with facility.† During the twenty-five years he remained secluded in his monastery, he diligently devoted himself to the study of Sanskrit, Pali, theology, history, geology, chemistry, and especially astronomy. His knowledge of the English language he acquired at the houses of the American missionaries, whom he was in the habit of visiting familiarly. Two of these gentlemen, Dr. House and Mr. Mattoon, were, throughout his reign and life, gratefully revered by him for that pleasant and profitable converse, which helped to unlock to him the secrets of European vigor and advancement, and to make straight and easy the paths of knowledge he had started upon.*

---

* *Modern Buddhist*, p. 1.

† Ibid. p. 3.

The late enlightened monarch also made efforts to reform the educational literature of the country, and in these he was materially assisted by his minister, Chao Phya Praklang, a man of an inquiring mind and of considerable general information. He found that the course of instruction given to the young in the monasteries, which were then the only extensive educational establishments in Siam, was altogether unprofitable. It consisted merely of the spelling-book, religious formulæ, and tales of genii and monsters, of enchantments and impossible achievements; there was nothing in the shape of real information in it. The treatise in general use on Cosmogony was the "Traiphoom," an ancient Buddhist work, generally regarded as sacred, but full of absurdities. Praklang undertook to write a work on elementary knowledge, and he collected the materials for it from the tracts published by the missionaries in Siam, and by seeking information from foreigners, American and European, whom he met with. It is to be feared, however, that he was at times deliberately deceived by his informants, or that some of them were ignorant persons, and told him not what they knew, but what they fancied was the truth; for, though his book contains much useful information, it is strangely mixed up with nonsense. It is said that the king would have undertaken the work—and if he had he would have done it better—but his position as sovereign was a bar to his attempting it.

---

* *English Governess.*

From what has been said, it appears that the Siamese, as a people, are but poorly educated. The late king did not reign long enough to carry out the designs he had formed, but he had the wisdom to give his own children a good English education, and for this purpose he engaged the services of Mrs. Anna Harriette Leonowens, an English widow lady, residing at Singapore, who had been strongly recommended to him by the Siamese consul at that city. Contrary to the advice and warnings of her friends, this intelligent and courageous woman took up her abode in the royal palace at Bangkok, having with her her own little boy, and there she remained from March, 1862, to July, 1867, doing her best to instil into the minds of her pupils, male and female, the highest principles of morality, and a solid knowledge of the English language and the ordinary branches of education. His majesty, Somdetch P'hra Paramendr Maha Mongkut, had sixty-seven children, so that her task was not a light one. But he was an exacting customer. "You shall educate them," said he, "and as many of my wives, likewise, as may wish to learn English. And I have much correspondence in which you must assist me; and, moreover, I have much difficulty for reading and translating French letters, for French are fond of using gloomily deceiving terms. You must undertake, and you shall make all their murky sentences and gloomily deceiving propositions clear to me; and, furthermore, I have by every mail foreign letters, whose writing is not easily read by me. You shall copy, in round-hand, for my ready perusal thereof."*

The brave lady undertook to do what was required of her, and the king took advantage of her willingness to work. It is, therefore, not surprising to learn that she had often to toil till ten o'clock at night to accomplish the endless translations required of her; but a miserable system of *espionage* prevailed in the palace, and she found herself constantly and closely watched; it was impossible to discover how or by whom. Yet, with all her efforts to perform thoroughly the duties required of her, the king was mean enough to repay her with ingratitude. He had promised to increase her salary, if, after a year's trial, she satisfied his expectations; but three years elapsed and no increase was made. She then reminded him of his promise, whereupon he turned round upon her and declared that she was "difficult and unmanageable, and had *not* given satisfaction."* This may serve as a warning to those who put faith in royal promises. "Put not your trust in princes," is a divine piece of advice.

---

* English Governess, p. 59.

Those who desire to gain a correct insight into the interior life of an Oriental court, will do well to read this work of Mrs. Leonowens. As a woman, she had access to those portions of the palace, into which no men, except the king and his sons and their immediate attendants, are admitted. The scenes of cruelty, treachery and infamy which she witnessed are graphically described, and prove that Siamese civilization is but skin-deep. Maha Mongkut, learned and intelligent as he was, and anxious as he was to inoculate his subjects with European and American notions, was at times no better than a ferocious tiger, especially when thwarted in any whim. Mrs. Leonowens states that occasionally he required of her, in her capacity of secretary, services not to be thought of by a European sovereign; and when she declined to perform them, he would curse her, close the gates of the palace against her, and even subject her to the insults and threats of the parasites and slaves who crawled about his feet. For refusing to write false letters to Sir John Bowring and Lord Clarendon he threatened to have her tried at the British consulate. In fact, the intervention of the British consul and Sir John Bowring more than once saved her from great peril.

The old tyrant has passed away; but the good seed sown by Mrs. Leonowens is now bearing fruit. His successor, the present king, was one of her best pupils, and he possesses a very amiable disposition. He speaks and writes English fluently, and is imbued (thanks to his preceptress) with the advanced ideas of modern civilization. Under his auspices schools are being established all over his kingdom, and the services of educated foreigners have been enlisted in the terribly up-hill work of educating an ignorant people. A good beginning has been made, but it will take more than a generation to start the Siamese fairly on the track of civilization. Their capacity for improvement in any direction is, however, undoubted; but the system of slavery, which long prevailed in Siam, being of the most cruel and debasing kind, has so degraded the people that there can be but little progress until its evil effects shall have worn off.

---

* *English Governess*, p. 269.

The insufficiency of mere learning to reconstitute a nation is demonstrated by the results of the late king's efforts in that direction. Mrs. Leonowens thus (unfairly, we think) sums up the matter:* "When I left the palace the king was fast failing in body and mind, and, in spite of his seeming vigor, there was no real health in his rule while he had his own way. All the substantial success we find in his administration is due to the energy and ability of his accomplished premier, Phya Kralahome, and even his strength has been wasted. The native arts and literature have retrograded; in the mechanic arts much has been lost, and the whole nation is given up to gambling." This last item is bad enough, but it is not ineradicable. A greater nation than Siam was at one time so addicted to this destructive vice that, from the king to the scavenger, throughout all grades of society, there was scarcely a person to be found who did not habitually play games of chance for money, and bet, and swear with the coarsest profanity upon every trivial occasion. Such was England in the days of Sir Robert Walpole; yet within a generation from his time the habits of the people had materially changed, and now gambling is exceptional among the English. So may it become with Siam if education and enlightenment should take root among the people.

The most recent accounts from Siam inform us that the young king is going about making speeches in praise of European civilization and modes of life. This is one of the many tokens, from Arabia to Japan, of the softening of Asiatic prejudices against Christian nations. In the case of Siam, the result is the same, but is mainly, if not wholly, due to the influence of Mrs. Leonowens, the young king's preceptress. On coming to the throne, one of his first acts was substantially to abolish the system of slavery to which we have alluded, and which from time immemorial had prevailed among the Siamese. It partly resembled the serfdom of Russia, the laborer being attached to the land, and even branded with his owner's mark; and partly the ancient feudal system of personal service. Siam being remote and little known in this country, this great act of emancipation attracted but little attention here, although it manumitted several millions of bondsmen. "And there is probably not one person in a hundred among us who realizes the fact that such an event—one of the landmarks of civilization—was brought about by the quiet teachings of an English lady within the walls of a Siamese harem. There are hundreds less worthy of the title than Mrs. Leonowens who have taken rank among the benefactors of mankind."* But, indeed, much of the world's civilization is due to the quiet and unostentatious influence of woman, and it would be a curious, as well as profitable and interesting study to trace the subject in detail.

---

* Ibid, p. 284.

There is one great evil which assuredly would be destroyed if the voice of enlightened womanhood were listened to as it ought to be, and that is polygamy, the bane of Asia, and the curse of every community where it is practised. It prevails very extensively in Siam. The king has as many wives as he pleases, some of the nobles have thirty or forty; but it is said that this polygamy is not attended by very evil results, notwithstanding the facility of divorcement, which also prevails. There is a great deal of domestic happiness in Siam; and suicides and husband and wife murders, so common in monogamic Europe, are rare there. Such is the testimony of Chao Phya Praklang,† who adds: "Nevertheless, many of the best men we have known were theoretical admirers of monogamy, and one practised it. At the time Jesus Christ lived, and still later, in Mahomet's time, there was no law of monogamy. Mahomet limited the number of wives to four, and after a time, Europeans instituted monogamy by law, not from religious motives but from conviction of its expediency, considering that the plurality of wives was unfair to women, and gave rise to jealousy and murder and constant trouble." The religion of Buddha highly commends a life of chastity: it also censures polygamy as involving ignorance and lust, but does not absolutely forbid it, the reason being that "Buddha could not say there was any actual wrong in a man having a number of wives *properly acquired!*" He also said that when a man could not remain a celibate and took but one wife, it was a kind of chastity, and commendable. It is remarkable how these founders of Oriental systems of religion refrained from boldly attacking the hideous social plague which prevailed around them; nay, some of them, Mahomet in particular, encouraged the evil both by practice and precept.

---

* Robert Dale Owen, in a letter to the New York *Times*, June, 1872.

† *Modern Buddhist*, pp. 81-8.

In Siamese households, it appears that one of the wives is recognized as the head wife, and to her belongs the supervision of the establishment, even to providing for the wants and comforts of her rivals, her husband's other wives. The head wife of the prime minister is described by Mrs. Leonowens as being kind to the younger women of her husband's harem, manifesting a most amiable interest in their welfare, and living among them happily as a mother among her daughters, sharing their confidences and often pleading their cause with her lord and theirs, over whom she exercised a very cautious but positive influence. This interesting lady was, however, between forty and fifty years of age, and evidently had worldly wisdom enough to understand that she could no longer compete in charms with the youthful beauties of the harem; so she made the best of the situation by attending to their comfort.

It does not follow, however, that the woman who is the man's first wife is always his head wife. The lady just described was the prime minister's second wife. And hence, perhaps, it is that in Siam there is no such personage as an heir-apparent to the throne, in the definite meaning and positive value which attaches to that phrase in Europe—no prince with an absolute and exclusive title by birth, adoption, or nomination to succeed to the crown. And though it is true that the eldest son of a Siamese sovereign by his queen or queen consort is recognized by all custom, ancient and modern, as the *probable* successor to the high seat of his royal sire, he cannot be said to have a clear and indefeasible right to it, because the question of his succession has yet to be decided by the electing voice of the Senabawdee, or grand council of princes and nobles, in whose judgment he may be ineligible, by reason of certain physical, mental, or moral disabilities, as extreme youth, effeminacy, imbecility, intemperance, profligacy, or the like. Nevertheless, the election is popularly expected to result in the choice of the eldest son of the queen or first wife, even if a regency should be necessary on account of his youth. The present king was only sixteen on his father's death, but the council elected him to assume the reins of government "notwithstanding his juvenility." He is described as being a conscientious and gentle boy, affectionate to his relatives, and generous and sympathetic towards the poor. He is now twenty years of age.

As regards the king and his queen or queens, the rule seems to be to select a lady expressly to be "the queen," and the wedding is attended with some very curious ceremonies. A Siamese king may have two "queens" at the same time; in which case the more favored lady is styled "the right hand" and the other "the left hand" of the throne. The late king had two, but not in conjunction. The first was of the right hand; the second, though chosen in the lifetime of the first, was not elevated to the throne until after the death of her predecessor. But the royal harem holds other wives and concubines, who do not appear in state.

One of the most extraordinary institutions of Siam is that of subordinate kingship, and it is not very easy to define its nature. The second king is elected by the grand council of princes and nobles, with the consent of the supreme king. The person chosen to fill the office is always one of the royal family, and is generally a son or brother of the reigning sovereign. He is allowed a palace and retinue, and he has the privilege—which is something in Oriental eyes—of being exempt from the customary prostrations before the first king, whom he may salute by simply raising his hands and joining them above his head. But he has to appear before him twice a year to renew his oath of allegiance. His functions are of the most indefinite kind. They are in fact such as may be confided to him by the supreme king, and he may be deprived of them at any moment. It depends on the affection which his supreme relative may bear towards him, and the opinion that personage may entertain of his abilities and his honor, whether his share in the government shall be important or insignificant.

With Oriental rulers suspicion and jealousy of their kindred have ever been predominant feelings. Unscrupulous in the means employed to attain their ends, they place no faith in anybody. The Siamese sovereigns have been no exception to the rule, though the present young king may prove one, as he has been educated under exceptional advantages. The late king, his father, procured the appointment of his own full elder brother, by the same mother, as second king; but as the latter was of an ardent and aspiring mind, and a very accomplished, handsome and popular man, the supreme king became very jealous of him, caused him to be continually watched, and forbade his marrying the woman he loved best in the land, because she was a famous beauty, and a princess of the first rank; moreover, the supreme king wanted her himself. Finally the king quarrelled with him openly, and, not long afterward, the latter sickened and died, being unaware up to the last moment that his death had been caused by slow poison, administered systematically by one of his own concubines. Whether the king, Maha Mongkut, had any hand in the murder is not certainly known, though strongly suspected. He wrote and published a long account of his brother's death, but in it he carefully concealed from the public the true cause of the calamity, fearing the foreign populace, and most of all the Laotians and the Peguans who were devoted to the prince, and might fix suspicion on himself, on the ground of his notorious jealousy of the second king. What followed was characteristic of the genuine Oriental despot. The royal physicians and the supreme council were sworn to secresy, the concubine and her female accomplice, together with nine female slaves, were tortured and publicly paraded through the environs of Bangkok, *though their crime was never openly named.* They were then thrown into an open boat, towed out into the Gulf of Siam, and there abandoned to the mercy of winds and waves or to death by starvation. One would think that Maha Mongkut would have proclaimed the nature of their crime if he wished their punishment to serve as an example. That he did not do so confirms the suspicion that he was privy to the murder of his brother.

In many respects Maha Mongkut was one of the most remarkable men of his age. In his private life he appears to great disadvantage; for, in addition to this affair of his brother, he was envious, revengeful, subtle, suspicious, cruel, fickle and petulant. He was the terror of the palace, and would cause the women who displeased him to be beaten and tortured unmercifully. His one redeeming trait was his fondness for his children, especially for those whose mother had been agreeable to him. But there is much to admire in his public life. In the pursuit of his appointed ends he was active and pertinacious. We have already spoken of his learning and literary labors. In them, as in everything else, no trouble or pains wearied or deterred him. In early life he acquired some knowledge of Latin and the sciences from the Jesuits, but when the Protestants came, in 1820, he manifested a preference for their methods of instruction, and finally placed himself under the permanent tutorship of Rev. Mr. Caswell, an American missionary, under whom he made great progress in liberal ideas of government and commerce. But that he made any in Christianity may well be doubted, for although he professed respect for its fundamental principles, he declared that *he hated the Bible.*[*]

---

[*] *The English Governess*, p. 240.

His religious opinions are set forth in that remarkable work, written by his order and dictation, "The Modern Buddhist,"* whence we may glean his reasons for so disliking the Bible. Among them were his belief that *any* religion, conscientiously held and observed, would fit a man for everlasting happiness, and that therefore Christianity was not entitled to claim for itself the sole power of salvation. He also thought there was no heaven nor hell, and no judgment; but that our sufferings merely arose from our non-observance of the laws of nature. Perhaps his strongest objection to the Bible is given in his own words. "He, as a Buddhist, might believe in the existence of a God, sublimed above all human qualities and attributes, a perfect God, above love and hatred and jealousy, calmly resting in a quiet happiness that nothing could disturb, and of such a God he would speak no disparagement; not from desire to please him, or fear to offend him, but from natural veneration. But he could not understand a God with the attributes and qualities of men, a God who loves and hates and shows anger, a Deity who, whether described to him by Christian missionaries, or by Mahometans, or Brahmins, or Jews, fell below his standard of even an ordinary good man."†

Maha Mongkut, as high-priest of Siam, became the head of a school which professed strictly the pure philosophy of Buddha—that is to say, the law of compensation, many births or transmigrations, and the attainment of Niphan or final beatitude, but not Nihilism. He rejected the theory of an ever-active Creator, and of miraculous intervention, and he told the missionaries that they must not imagine that any of his party would ever become Christians, for they could not embrace what they considered a foolish religion. Nevertheless, on his accession to the throne (April, 1851), he sent for the American missionaries, thanked them cordially for all they had taught him, assuring them that it was his earnest desire to administer his government after the model of the limited monarchy of England, and to introduce schools, wherein the Siamese youth might be well taught in the English language and literature, and the sciences of Europe.

---

* *Kitchanukit.*

† P. 25.

His foreign policy was liberal, he extended toleration to all religious sects, and he expended large sums in public buildings and improvements. He abolished several oppressive taxes, reduced the duties on foreign shipping, and in other ways encouraged foreign commerce. In 1855, he effected a commercial treaty with England, which has proved very beneficial to both parties. In May, 1856, he concluded one, substantially the same, with the United States, and, later in the year, one with France. Hitherto, Portugal had been the only foreign power having a resident Consul at Bangkok, but the treaties brought along with them Consuls of the three powers, and foreign merchants and traders flocked to Bàngkok, and established rice-mills, sugar and oil refineries, and warehouses for imports. Millions of dollars flowed in where only a few thousands had flowed before. Soon after this, treaties were concluded with every commercial nation, and the country rapidly increased in prosperity.

Then an English harbor-master and an English chief of police brought order and safety into operation; a French commander was found for the army; and an American was appointed head of the custom house. The Singapore Telegraph Company was empowered to construct telegraph lines through Moulmein to Singapore, with a branch to Bangkok, and a sanitarium was erected at Anghin, on the coast, for the benefit of native and foreign invalids. The king built himself a superb palace, after the model of Windsor Castle, and also numerous other palaces in different parts of the country; and the nobility followed his example. But the king never gave way to luxury. In his daily habits he was remarkably industrious and abstemious. He was much devoted to astronomy, and he calculated with respectable accuracy the great solar eclipse of August, 1868. He rendered every possible assistance to the foreign commissioners sent out to observe the eclipse in Siam, expending not less than $100,000 in erecting a commodious observatory for them, and in entertaining the foreigners present during the eclipse. It was his last exploit, for the excitement of the scene, combined with the noxious atmosphere of the jungle, brought on the fever of which he died on the 1st of October following.

When its inhabitants shall have become sufficiently enlightened in the arts and sciences to develop to the fullest extent the capacities of its soil, Siam will be one of the most productive countries in the world. The fertility of the land is inexhaustible. The great river Meinam rolls through an immense continuous level of the richest soil, well watered by tributary streams, canals, and rain. Great variety of grain and fruit grows almost spontaneously under the tropical heat. The staples are rice, sugar, indigo, cotton, tobacco, coffee, olives and figs. There are several species of palms yielding sugar, and forests of teak, ebony, satinwood and eaglewood. Ivory, beeswax, honey, raw silk, and many aromatic gums and spices are also obtained in great abundance. Then, again, the variety and beauty of the scenery, with its luxuriance of verdure, flowers and foliage, and picturesque forests, will make it a most attractive land for foreigners.

Siam is a vast plain; it is only when the traveller approaches the borders of the land that he sees lofty mountains, crowned with impenetrable forests. This plain is bounded on the east by a spur of the Himalaya range, which breaks off in Cambodia, and is found again in the west, extending almost to the extremity of the Malayan States. On the north these two mountain ranges approach each other, and form a multitude of small hills. Siam has some excellent harbors, and that at Bangkok has from sixty to seventy feet of water. The gulf is free from the typhoons which are so destructive in the Chinese seas. The country resembles Egypt in one particular, that of annual inundation in the months of June, July, and August, by the waters of the great river Meikhong and its tributaries, which unite with the waters of the Meinam and the Phibsalok, and overflow the entire plain, so that boats traverse it in every direction without injury to the young rice crop springing up underneath.

It is evident that Siam opens a great field for engineering. The regulating of this annual inundation by a system of barrage, like that of Egypt, is one very great desideratum. Railways are another; so are gas-works, water-works and the fabrication of the numerous contrivances which make up the comforts of civilized life. It is the earnest desire of the present king to see them all in operation, as they doubtless will be before many years shall have passed. There is also scope for the introduction of manufactures of every kind, and for many of them the country could supply the raw material in abundance. A profitable trade might also be carried on in articles of ornamentation made out of the shells of fish, the skins of animals, the feathers of birds, of which Siam produces many varieties of extraordinary beauty, and fragrant woods like rosewood, satinwood, sapanwood, ebony and cedar. Siam likewise has mines of iron, antimony, gold and silver, and quarries of white marble; but they are poorly worked, and small importance is now attached to them by the Siamese. Yet the gold of Bangtaphon is esteemed the purest and most ductile in the world. That these mines were once largely worked is evident from the number of pits bearing marks of great age, and from the extraordinary quantity of idols and works of art cast in these metals, and consumed in the construction of images, and the adornment of temples, pagodas, and palaces.

Of these last-mentioned edifices there are some remarkable ruins in certain parts of the Siamese dominions, especially in Cambodia. They are of unknown antiquity, and no history tells us what manner of people built them, whence came their civilization and culture, or why and whither they disappeared from among the nations of the earth. The structures are stupendously grand and elaborately ornamented, yet not resembling in style those of other ancient empires. Without doubt the Cambodian must have been one of the most powerful empires of the East in its time, whenever that was. There is nothing but tradition to guide one to an opinion; but this is too vague to be relied upon. The mythology of the country carries its origin back to B. C. 3,800, and some of the native writers assert that the empire lasted 1,300 years, while others say 2,400. If the former are right, it came to an end about the time of the foundation of the first Assyrian Empire by Belus, or Nimrod (according to Dr. Hales); if the latter, about the time of Deborah and Barak. But the more learned Cambodians do not accept either statement as authentic.

The really authentic history of Siam, Pegu, Cambodia, and Laos does not go back more than 700 or 800 years. Their early annals abound in fables of heroes, demigods, giants and genii, as those of all ancient nations do, and they afford but few facts of practical value. The Siamese era commences with the year A. D. 638, but the first great event is the foundation of the city of Ayudia, or Ayuthia, described by Mendelslohe as "the Venice of the East," as before mentioned. This occurred in A. D. 1350, when a chief, named Phya-Athong, assumed the title of Phra (or king) Rama Thibodi, and made the new city his capital, fortifying it with turretted battlements, with ponderous gates and by a wide and deep moat spanned by drawbridges. But as it was situated near the river Meinam, about sixty miles only from the gulf of Siam, it was easily accessible to the Burmese pirates, who harrassed it continually, and ravaged the surrounding country. They were unable to take the city, however; and Thibodi's successor, Suen, routed a large army of them with immense slaughter, pursuing them to their capital, Chiengmai. From this expedition he turned his arms against Cambodia, took the capital by storm, slew every male capable of bearing arms, and carried off enormous treasures in plate gold, with which, on his return to his kingdom, he erected a remarkable pagoda, called to this day "the mountain of gold."

From these early times down to very recent, the history of Siam is more or less mixed up with that of Burmah, Laos, and Cambodia, its immediate neighbors, which were sometimes its tributaries, but sometimes it was their tributary, according to the fortune of war. Its domestic history is full of fierce feuds between the members of the royal family, in which the nobles and landed proprietors took an active part. By these feuds the country was devastated and impoverished; in some parts it was depopulated. Here we have Oriental history in all its hideous, as well as good features. The happiness and the misery of the people depended almost entirely on the personal character of the king for the time being. It has ever been so from time immemorial in China, India, Siam, Persia and Turkey. A great warrior arises and takes possession of the throne, plunders and subjugates the surrounding nations, builds sumptuous edifices, and dies. He is succeeded by an indolent or feeble prince, and the realm is speedily a prey to the struggles of his kinsman or some powerful chief for the crown, and the prosperity of the nation soon disappears. The only points of interest in such annals are the personal exploits of the actors in the scenes described. These often border on the romantic, and the Siamese records contain some very remarkable instances.

As marking the characteristics of the Siamese, these legends are worthy of attention. We will cite three of them. On the death of king Inthra Racha, A. D. 780, two of his sons, who were each ruling over a northern province, set out from their seat of government simultaneously for the capital, Ayutha, with the design of seizing and occupying the vacant throne. Mounted on elephants, they met in the dusk of evening on a bridge leading to the royal palace, and each instantly dismounted, divining his brother's purpose, and with their naked swords fell upon each other with such fury that both were slain on the spot.

The second instance is more romantic, and relates to the exploits of a woman, Queen Sisudah-Chand, famed alike for her beauty and her fiendish disposition. She lived about the close of the ninth century, and was regent of Siam during the minority of her son, the king P'hra Yat-Fa. She was very superstitious, believing in astrological predictions, and a cunning astrologer gained complete ascendency over her. Persuading her that her life was in danger from one of the royal family, she ordered the entire royal household, including her own mother and sisters, to be assassinated. She then put her son, the king, to death, and raised the astrologer to the throne. The nobility and people, exasperated and disgusted, watched their opportunity for destroying the infamous pair, not daring to attack them in their palace, which was well fortified. One day, as the queen and her paramour were in a barge on their customary visit to her private pagoda and garden, a nobleman hailed them, as if for instructions, and, being allowed to approach, he suddenly sprang upon them, drew his sword and despatched them both.

The crown was then offered to an uncle of the murdered king. This prince, known as Maha Chakrapat Racha-therat, displayed in his own person one of the most brilliant illustrations of Oriental chivalry. With an immense army he invaded Pegu. The king of that country, having but a small force, nevertheless advanced to meet him. In consideration of the great disparity between the two armies, the king of Siam proposed to the king of Pegu to decide the fortune of the day by single combat. The proposal was accepted, the two monarchs encountered each other, but the king of Pegu's elephant took fright and carried him off the field. His heroic queen, Maha Chandra, immediately took his place, and was soon killed. From these narratives we see that these Oriental sovereigns habitually used elephants, instead of horses, in their warlike expeditions, and that they were attended by their wives and female warriors. It also would seem to have been considered no disgrace for a man to fight a woman. In fact, from the remotest times to the present, female warriors have been common in Asia and Africa, and kings have had body guards composed entirely of women.

Passing over seven centuries, during which Siamese history repeats itself continually, we come to the sixteenth century, the epoch of the Portuguese explorations and conquests in the East. Several thousands of these adventurous Europeans enlisted in the service of the King of Burmah. They were excellent soldiers, and ably commanded by their countryman, Diego Suanes, and were superior to any troops which the East could bring against them. In 1568 they invaded Siam and made it tributary to Burmah. It remained so until 1583, when the Siamese regained their independence. The Portuguese of Malacca, however, were invited to establish themselves in Siam for purposes of trade; an embassy was sent to Goa, their chief settlement in the East, and the Dominican monks were invited to build churches and preach Christianity in Siam.

Then follows one of the most remarkable episodes in Siamese history. During the reign of P'hra Narai, a most able and estimable man, a Greek, named Constantine Phaulkon, was wrecked on the coast of Malabar. Meeting there with a party of Siamese officials, returning to their own country, he became a fellow-passenger with them, quickly contrived to learn their language, and so ingratiated himself with them that they introduced him to P'hra Narai, who took him into the government service. Through his sagacity, tact and diligence he rapidly rose in favor, and finally became prime minister. The French priests spared no efforts to gain him over secretly to their plans, which were the introduction of the Jesuits, and the conversion of Eastern Asia to Christianity. Bishops were sent out by the Pope to Cochin China, Cambodia, Siam, and Pegu, at the expense of Louis XIV. of France, who, however, insisted that they should all be Frenchmen, and that the glory of the enterprise should be ascribed exclusively to France and to himself.

The Jesuits opened schools, and labored successfully to introduce the ideas and arts of Europe into Siam; but they failed to convert the king to Christianity. After some years P'hra Narai sent an embassy to Louis, who immediately returned the compliment by sending the Chevalier De Chaumont with five ships of war, Father Tachard, and a number of priests. They anchored in the Meinam on the 27th of September, 1687, and were graciously received by the king, who, nevertheless, told them he feared the chief object of their mission—the establishing of a French protectorate in Siam, and the conversion of himself and people—would not be so easy a task as they had been led to believe. In all this the Jesuits had been from the first deceived by Phaulkon, who designed to use them for his own purposes. De Chaumont and his fleet returned to France in 1688, and Phaulkon then set to work to stir up dissatisfaction with the king among the people. He persuaded P'hra Narai to send another embassy to Louis, and devoted himself, meanwhile, to gaining the favor of the people by promoting trade and agriculture, encouraging foreign commerce, building splendid edifices, and improving the laws. All this was marvellous in the eyes of the Siamese, who styled him the "Vicha-yen," or incarnation of "cool wisdom."

But his ambition, arrogance and ostentation aroused the hostility of the nobles against him and the too partial king. The latter, falling ill, repaired to the premier's palace at Lapchaburee. Thither some of the disaffected nobles, headed by a natural son of his own, went and forced their way into his room. The old monarch died defending himself bravely. The assassins then broke into Phaulkon's room, where he was attended by his young daughter, Constantia, dragged him into the woods, killed him, and flung his body into a pit. His daughter witnessed his sufferings, cheered him with her passionate endearments, and holding before his eyes a cross of gold, besought him to die like a brave man and a Christian. She was dragged into slavery and concubinage by one of his murderers. After these brutal achievements the affairs of the country fell into confusion, and the Burmese, taking advantage thereof, overran and ravaged the kingdom.

The country was freed of its invaders through the courage and genius of one of the feudal lords of Siam, Phya Tâh, originally a Chinese adventurer, who had amassed wealth, and held the office of governor of the northern provinces under the late king. By a series of daring manœuvres he not only expelled the Burmese, but recovered Cambodia. He was very kind to the poor and beloved by his soldiers; but he was haughty and exacting towards the nobles. In revenge, they procured one of his concubines to drug his food and render him insane. In that condition he committed such excesses that the people, headed by the nobles, attacked the palace. He escaped by a secret passage to a neighboring monastery, where he was betrayed to his prime minister, who caused him to be put to death. This minister then usurped the throne, and firmly established himself thereon. The history of Siam becomes unimportant and uninteresting from this period down to the accession of Maha Mongkut, the late king. The foregoing brief extracts from its previous history* are sufficient to give the reader an idea of the characteristics of the Siamese as a political community, with its relations towards foreign nations. But under the late and the present government, and especially since the making of the treaties with the United States, Great Britain and France, Siam has taken her place among the community of civilized nations, and her foreign relations are now conducted on the system which prevails among them.

The changes which have taken place in the internal government of the country, the abolition of slavery and the introduction of a system of general education, have already wrought such amelioration in the condition of the people as to render antiquated the observations of former travellers, even of so recent a one as Mr. F. A. Neale, who visited Siam in 1840, and was for some months in the military service of the king, and who has given to the world a very vivid description of the manners and customs of the people. But for hundreds of years previously these had remained unchanged, as had also their modes of government and ways of thinking. This is characteristic of all Oriental nations. Century after century passes away with them unmarked by progress and undistinguished by change. Traveller succeeds traveller at long intervals of time, and each repeats unconsciously the observations of the other. Thus Mr. Neale found the Siamese precisely the same as they were in the days of the Jesuit missionary, La Loubère, who visited them in 1687, and published a work descriptive of the country and its inhabitants, which was applicable to them when Mr. Crawford was among them in 1827; but which, it is tolerably certain, will be in great part inapplicable to them fifty years hence, when railways, telegraphs, and newspapers shall have full sway.

Allusion has been made to the vast ruins and remains of ancient temples in Siam, whose origin is unknown. Some of the works of the builders of these marvels still remain in use.

---

* See Narrative of a Residence at the Capital of the Kingdom of Siam, Chap. XIII., by Fred. Arthur Neale, from which the sketch given by Mrs. Leonowens is taken.

Among them are two imposing stone bridges, 500 feet long and 80 feet broad, carried on arches, which rest firmly on their foundations, buttressed by fifty great stone pillars, and supporting a road-bed composed of immense blocks of stone, laid one upon another, and so adjusted that their very weight seems to keep the arches firm. Yet the western nations know nothing of the existence of the race who built in a style surpassing in boldness of conception, grandeur of proportions, and delicacy of design, the best works of the modern world. Vainly may we seek for any chronicle of the long line of monarchs who must have swayed the sceptre of the once powerful empire of Maha Naghkon. Only a vague tradition has come down of a celestial prince to whom the fame of founding the great temple at Ongkoor, in Cambodia, is attributed; and of *an Egyptian king*, who, for his sacrilege, was changed into a leper. An interesting statue, representing the latter, stands in one of the corridors of that temple, somewhat mutilated, but sufficiently well preserved to display a marked contrast with the physical type of the present race of Cambodians.

These magnificent edifices seem to have been designed for places of worship rather than of royal habitation, for they are nearly all Buddhist temples. They are all built on the plan of a cross, called "phram," denoting the four cardinal points of the horizon. This cross is invariably found in the plan of the religious monuments of ancient Cambodia, and even the corridors are made to intersect each other at right angles. The cross is also the distinctive character and sign for the Doctors of Reason, in the primitive Buddhism of Kasyapa. The emblem of the Snake God, Sarpa-deva, more commonly called Phya Naght, is also common. The wonderful structure at Naghkon Watt, of which Mrs. Leonowens has given so interesting a description,* is nearly three miles in circumference; the walls are from seventy to eighty feet high, and twenty feet thick.

Mr. Finlayson † calls attention to the resemblance between a certain adjunct to the Buddhist temples at Bangkok, called the Pra-cha-di, and the small chambers found in the Pyramids of Egypt. The Pra-cha-di is a solid building of masonry, without aperture or inlet of any sort, however large the building may be. It is generally built in the neighborhood of some temple, but is not itself an object or place of worship, being always distinct from the temple. In its origin it would appear to have been sepulchral, and destined to commemorate either the death of Buddha or his translation into heaven. These ornamental buildings are supposed to contain some relict of Buddha. They are built upon a series of terraces, which gradually diminish to half the whole height, and are then succeeded by a handsome spire, fluted and ornamented. They are about 250 feet high.

---

* *English Governess*, chap. xxix.

† *Mission to Siam and Hué in* 1821–2, edited by Sir T. S. Raffles, F.R.S.

The design of the small chambers of the Pyramids of Egypt has been variously explained; some considering them as sepulchral depositories, and others as *adyta* of the more sacred and retired mysteries. The truth possibly may be that each conjecture is correct, and that in the office of a sepulchral shrine, as well as in form, the Pyramid and the Pra-cha-di exactly coincide. The Pra-cha-di is the same structure that is called Dagoba by the Buddhists of Ceylon. Several circumstances and ceremonies in the religion of Buddha would seem to identify its origin, in a great measure, with that of ancient Egypt. The physiognomy, the form and stature of Buddha are as distinctly Ethiopic as they are different from those which characterize the various tribes which inhabit either the eastern or the western parts of Asia. That it is a religion foreign to that continent, the uncertainty which still exists with regard to the country or district which gave it birth would seem to render probable. The proofs which have been brought forward in favor of Ceylon and of Magodha seem to rest upon very slender foundations. Several festivals in this religion bear a strong resemblance to the ceremonies performed by the ancient Egyptians on the rising of the Nile. That called Periharah is of this nature. Are not the Egyptian Pyramids the prototype of the Pra-cha-di or Dagoba? And instead of considering these stupendous monuments as the tombs of earthly kings, ought we not rather to regard them as owing their origin to religious motives? It is scarcely possible to believe that any other motive could have induced men to undertake works of such magnitude. The small chambers found in the interior of some of them might have contained, or, at least, have been intended to contain relics, such as bones of their deity. And this idea is confirmed by the finding of bones of the bull in the sarcophagus of the pyramid of Cephrenes.*

The significance of the statue and legend of the Egyptian king, in connection with the great Siamese temple of Ongkoor, should not be lost sight of, nor should the common use of the word "P'hra" (Pharaoh) as a title of the Siamese kings. Then there are the similarities between some of the customs of Siam and of ancient Egypt. What does all this point to but to the fact that at some very remote period the Egyptians, or a people identical with them, held sway over that portion of the globe which comprises Siam, Cambodia, and Cochin China? But the Egyptians were red-skinned, and the Siamese are a mixture of black, yellow, and white, and there are no vestiges of a red race among them. Either, then, the length of time which has elapsed since the red men were there has been enormous, or there has been some great change in the face of the globe, which severed those of the race in Asia from those in Egypt and America, the Atlantide races, of whom little but tradition is left in the old world, but some of whose immense structures can still be seen in certain islands of the Pacific.

But this is all speculation. The wonderful architectural remains of Siam and Cambodia offer a field of investigation which has as yet been only superficially approached by unlearned travellers. They require to be examined by men like Layard or Rawlinson or Champallion; and doubtless the present enlightened ruler of the country would facilitate and assist every research by persons duly qualified. Enough has been said to show that Siam at the present moment offers singular attractions for foreigners, as their services are required in a variety of ways. Americans, Englishmen and Frenchmen are already there in numbers, superintending factories, constructing machinery, building steamships and locomotives, making telegraph and railway lines, organizing the military and marine services, preaching Christianity, teaching in schools, and generally changing the habits, elevating the character, and developing the intelligence of the people. It is curious to speculate on what Siam will be fifty years hence.

---

* Fitzclarence's *Route through India and Egypt to England*, p. 499.

ART. II.—1. *The Life and Writings of* RUFUS CHOATE. By SAMUEL GILMAN BROWN, Professor in Dartmouth College. Two volumes. 1862. Boston.

2. *Reminiscences of* RUFUS CHOATE, *the Great American Advocate.* By EDWARD G. PARKER. 1860. Boston.

3. *Proceedings of the Bar upon the Death of* RUFUS CHOATE, *in* 1859, *and the Address of Professor* THEOPHILUS PARSONS, *at the Cambridge Law School, upon him as a Lawyer.*

4. *The Speech of* RUFUS CHOATE *in the Dalton Divorce Case; also, The Celebrated Trial of Firrell, the Somnambulist, for Murder.* Pamphlets.

PROSE is the machinery of civilized society. It grew up with civilization. In the early ages men talked, but all great events were first chanted or sung. Bards preceded historians and prose writers. Indeed, eloquence and prose writing were emanations after mankind had made some progress in civilization. In the contests of these times the passions were excited by war songs and by the enchantment of the bard. Language was then meagre and these songs were simple but full of tropes, as illustration supplies the dearth of words. So, in that age, speech followed the same law; and the first prose of any people is simple in structure and bold in figures. It is also usually irregular and is improved with the advancement of the people. Speech is a composite achievement. It is about the last achievement of civilization in nations when we speak of its best forms. The period of literary purity in Rome and Greece survived the age of pure eloquence, and then prose writers preceded the orators. Indeed, oratory, as high art, is an outgrowth of ages in every free state. Like all the fine arts, it is of slow growth. Speaking has always existed in every society in some form, but oratory is not effective except when men have understandings to be addressed as well as passions.

In every free state, where the people govern, oratory has ever been the great instrument to control and carry on society; and in free states the greatest examples of eloquence have appeared. It was at the Revolution that popular eloquence first appeared among us, though we had existed as colonies for a century and a half. Since that age America has had clever orators, and has not been without men who could take high rank as public speakers. We certainly can claim that there are more men who can address a public body intelligently and well in this country than can be found in any other civilized state. Yet we will not assert that among these innumerable speakers we could find many first-class speakers, as ranged by a high standard of eloquence. Surely none will pretend that we have had many men whose speeches would sustain a comparison with the first orators. We know that we fail in the art of eloquence rather than in the substantials of speaking; but we realize that the revolutionary age gave us Henry and Lee, Otis and Adams, and since we have produced several noble speakers. Nobody questions that Webster and Clay hold a place among the great speakers of modern times. The best specimens of eloquence have so far been of the deliberative order, and from the interest taken in public affairs we shall always find eloquence in this department. The Pulpit ought to present an equal field for oratory, but nearly all effective eloquence is banished there by the reading of sermons. So long as this practice remains the American pulpit will never compare with the eloquence of the Bar or of the Senate for the effect produced by delivery. No speaker can look after a written speech or sermon and command and sway his audience. Let the ministry study extemporaneous eloquence and speak thirty minutes, with adequate preparation, and eloquence will gain what logic may lose in pulpit oratory.

But we turn to the American bar, where eloquence has shone forth and where the first talents are trained and displayed. Society is interested in her lawyers, for they fashion and make the laws and stand guardian to person and property. It is the lawyer who defends all rights of person and property, and without him those rights could not be adjudicated upon in the courts. His calling is devoted to the great interests of society itself, and so he becomes, by his vocation, a counsellor of men and of the state. The science of law begins with the foundation of the state, and he necessarily becomes cognizant of the laws in all their complexity. So the lawyer first studies fundamental, constitutional principles on which depend the rights of men. He then advances to the laws of property and of person. Thus trained, he appears as a counsel and an advocate. In a crude state of society he partakes of all the qualities of such a state, and his qualifications seldom exceed the demand, and we pass out of a semi-barbarous state before we find the accomplished advocate and great jurisconsult. This great and finished barrister comes with civilization, and he is the necessity of it. It needs no proofs that when society has risen to the complications of a great state, where law is supreme, there must be such an office as that of the great legist. Thus the profession grows with the state and the laws. They are co-ordinate with each other.

From the beginning of these colonies the laws have required a learned profession, and perhaps we have erred in the facilities to its growth. Whether this be so or not the profession comprises its necessary men—men who sustain the learning and repute of the bar in every branch of society, and secure the rights of every hamlet in the land. So much for the necessity of the profession. Without it nothing would be secure in the transmission of property; without it there could be no administration of the law.

So let us turn to one of the necessary men of society, and consider some of his virtues and give a summary of what he was in his day and generation at the American bar. Rufus Choate stood, by common consent, at the head of the New England bar at the time of his demise, and was its most accomplished advocate. Such position he held for the last few years of his life; and it was won by thirty-five years of constant struggle in that forum, and mainly at Boston, the great metropolis of New England. He encountered Mason and Webster in that struggle, after his removal to Boston; and these jurists never went to sleep when they encountered Choate, though he was many years their junior. Choate always sustained himself, and he rose to the first rank of lawyers, in spite of such antagonism; and, finally, he held the position, after the death of Webster, of being the great New England advocate. We now proceed to give a brief sketch of what he was as a lawyer and advocate; we shall glance at his attainments and the character of his achievements.

Mr. Choate graduated at Dartmouth with the honors of his class, in 1819, at the age of twenty, and became tutor in the college; then entered the Cambridge Law School, and finally became a student with Mr. Wirt, then attorney-general of the United States, and who was one of the leaders of the law at Washington. While he resided there, he saw and heard Pinkney and Webster in their last struggle, when the former fell mortally ill by over-exertion to meet his younger antagonist, who was then one of the few who could dispute his supremacy at the American bar. Soon after this the great advocate, Thomas Addis Emmet, at the New York bar, was stricken down and fell in a like encounter with Webster. He and Wirt and O'Conor then became in a short time the most conspicuous advocates in the American forum. But Choate also heard Pinkney's great speech in the Senate on the Missouri question; and he said that Webster made a grand opening in that last cause, but that he was bold and dry as compared with Pinkney. Thus Choate was enchanted with the Maryland lawyer, and greatly dazzled with his worth and his forensic display. Choate became an imitator of all the vices as well as the virtues of this great advocate, and gave more particular study to Pinkney's arguments than any of the young advocates of a succeeding age. Mr. Choate, in consequence of a long illness of Wirt, did not then hear him in any great cause. So we have no stated comparison on the part of Choate as to these two famous lawyers. However, Wirt gave his pupil a high testimonial, in which he predicted Mr. Choate's eminence in the profession; and thus provided with a certificate of good conduct and correct deportment, Mr. Choate returned home to mourn the early death of a younger brother of great promise, then in the course of graduation at Dartmouth. After some further study, he was admitted to the bar, and entered upon its practice in his native county of Essex. He hung out his sign-board for one night at Salem, and then moved to Danvers for the next three years, then returned to Salem, and was, at the age of thirty-two, elected to Congress, after having served two terms in the State legislature. He was reëlected to Congress, and finally, in 1834, resigned and removed to Boston.

It is said that Choate, during his first three years at the bar, seriously thought of giving up his profession. A little pushing, and fortune smiled upon him, and he gradually grew to great eminence, as he at once exhibited the same brilliant parts which became so conspicuous at the bar of Boston. His growing fame enabled him to establish himself securely at the Boston bar—that greater forum, where he continued to live, and where he died, in 1859, in the sixtieth year of his age. His struggle for the first years after his removal to Boston was severe, but success, with some delay, attended him, though he met the ablest lawyers in all New England daily in his practice. These were Mason and Webster of the older lawyers, and Curtis, Bartlett, Dexter and Dana of the succeeding bar, and who attested the consummate ability and resources of Rufus Choate in every department of law. Choate had to sustain himself against such adversaries; but he proved adequate to the exigency, and triumphed in the end. Like the still living and still powerful O'Conor, he was almost irresistible with a jury and could win the most desperate causes. This was owing to his skill in managing the cause quite as much as to his powers as an advocate. His law knowledge was the most thorough and exact. He never tired in preparing a case, and he never finished it until it was tried. He always comported himself at the bar most respectfully to judge, jury, and opposing counsel. He never put a witness in the attitude of defence, except on exceptional occasions; then he came down on him with crushing effect.

Mr. Choate had the greatest judgment and skill in the examination of witnesses. He seldom gave opposing witnesses an opportunity to damage his side. Once he pressed a witness to state what the accused said when they robbed the vessel, and got the response that one of the parties remarked that Choate could clear them though they were caught with the stolen money in their boots. Choate went on with the laugh against him. Above all, he went to the jury with the most effective logic, and had the skill to know when he had the jury with him. He, like Scarlett, wheedled, and, like Erskine, rushed the jury over weak places in a cause. He could argue a cause before a full bench as well as before a jury. This is a rare combination of power in any man—all knowledge and words, as he called it; and no man could surpass him in making known just what he thought in any case. He had great logical and analytical powers.

Choate stood high as a jurist, but his mind was really that of the great advocate. There his powers had free play, and in advocacy he achieved his preëminence and standing at the bar. This combination of talents is not usually found in one man. Some have great logical power and vast learning, but no great power of clothing their ideas and giving the best expression to them. Others, with no particular attainments, are fluent and voluble in words, but have no considerable power to generalize, and little breadth or compass of thought. Choate was clear and strong in statement as well as convincing and persuasive. He was a greater master of the law than Erskine, equalled him in the force of the advocate, though, with all his consummate study, he fell below him as a model of forensic style. Erskine, like Choate, was a master of Shakespeare, and this mastery is felt in every line of his advocacy. This is not so felt in the style of Choate. So, while Choate was a greater legist in his profession, yet he had not the correct forensic speech of Erskine. But Choate is not reported like Erskine at the bar, and not one of his hundred efforts is embraced in his works lately published, because it was said to be impossible to report chain-lightning. Still, had Choate possessed such opportunities as Erskine, his speeches of nine hours' length would have appeared in the press, as did that in the Dalton case, though filling sixteen columns of the Boston papers. Surely, he wanted a great occasion for speech at the bar, and so we cannot judge what he might have done in causes like Erskine's. Suffice it that his forensic speeches are not collected, but lost, like those of Emmet and Ogden Hoffman. His family, in publishing the life and writings of Mr. Choate, have left his fame to rest upon his public addresses and speeches. It would seem that the great speech in the Dalton case might have been included in the works of Rufus Choate, that it might remain to after times to prove that he was the Hortensius of the New England bar. It would seem as altogether proper that his great argument in the Goodyear case, where he encountered Webster for the last time and displayed his wonderful genius to that high court, might have been embraced.

Since not one of Choate's forensic arguments have, it seems, been thought worthy of preservation, we must study Choate as a statesman and a scholar in his life and writings, which embrace nothing more. Choate's style was rich and luminous as he approached the meridian of life. His latest speeches showed a greater simplicity. Age usually simplifies rather than embellishes, and Choate's last of the collected speeches proves that he had composed himself in style and delivery since the great Webster eulogy. His manner of expression is more natural and his thought is rich and philosophic. There was less accumulation and ornateness in style in this last effort. His speeches upon the hustings and in Faneuil Hall show also that he could express himself with concise strength. His speech in 1844, made in opposition to the annexation of Texas, possesses those qualities in a marked degree.

Many of his speeches contain none of those interminable sentences which once or twice marred the great Dartmouth eulogy. One sentence of thirteen hundred words is a reflection on Choate's judgment and taste. It is clear, but such an enumeration of particulars wearies the mind and is a reflection on all true rules of composition. Indeed, we have the theory that Choate's written productions were less faultless than his extemporary eloquence, and his bar speeches showed this quite clearly. He went beyond all precedent in some of his sentences, and outstripped the prose of Milton and Jeremy Taylor. Choate avoided this excess of construction in many of his speeches; and his translations show that he could at once compose with the brevity of Tacitus or with the length of Thucydides. It thus appears that his sentences could bend to his needs. His speech was always full and unbroken. He could use the short sentence with the greatest force, like the great French writers; but he naturally fell into the rounded period. He stood at the antipodes of Macaulay in this. Choate was nervous, strong, and his writing not natural and easy; yet it was flowing, rich and brilliant. Macaulay is rich, but broken into the simple sentence. He who takes the pains to analyze these two writers will see that Choate has strength, while Macaulay has ease, naturalness and one of the best styles in the language. Macaulay, like the writers of the age of Anne, follows the simplicity of the French, while Choate followed those who lived in the time of Elizabeth. Choate studied Burke daily, but he caught not much of his taste or style. He admired Webster, but never felt the full force of his simplicity. Rather, he really imitated no orator, and his style bore the marks of a genius, somewhat wanting in true taste and judgment in his writings, if not in his forensic efforts. He was unsurpassed in the range of his studies: he got his force from rapidity of utterance, and thus counteracted the slow strength of Webster.

As an orator, he had not only great rapidity of speech but often too violent action. Rather tall, dark, but striking in person, his action was not so much studied as his utterance and style. He had not the finish of Everett, nor the majesty of Webster in his delivery, but he had a fire and animation which they did not possess. He had practised oratory and the daily reading of the orators, for nearly forty years, to get expression; and that grand organ, though quite monotonous in tone, never failed to animate his eloquence. He never overcame a somewhat awkward manner, with all his self-discipline, nor, like Demosthenes, made his natural defects wholly yield to his genius. It is said that his action on one occasion was so violent that his coat yielded to the exertion; but it is also said that this violence of action gradually yielded to the subduing effects of age, as was the case with his great model, William Pinkney. In the Dalton case, this calmness was observable, and still more marked when he made his last remarks upon Webster, in 1859.

Thus Rufus Choate, with all his vivid, glowing, passionate and animated rhetoric, was not the first forensic orator of our country, though, in many respects, he was a marvel in speech. He never reached the calm grandeur of Webster, or his great style and force. Choate fell back on a wider reading and study, but he never possessed Webster's solidity. Yet it is equally certain that Choate was more exciting and stirring than Webster. Quite sure we are that Choate never could have made Webster's reply to Hayne. He had the words but not the strength to make such a speech. But on an ordinary occasion, and in the usual trial of such a cause, Choate was more successful than Webster.

As already intimated, Mr. Choate was an exact and thorough scholar. His translations at Dartmouth were as brilliant as those of William Pitt. He took the first honors and carried away the prize of scholarship. He surpassed Webster in the achievements at their *alma mater;* and, like Webster, at college he was a general and devouring reader. Choate accumulated about 7,000 assorted volumes in his private library, and in later years, every Saturday found him, as a habit, wending his way home with a new book for the studies of that day. He became entirely domesticated and absorbed in his books. Society intruded not much upon his studies of Burke and Shakespeare; for these, with Bacon and Milton, he pronounced the four greatest authors of our langaage. His order of precedence was, Shakespeare, Bacon, Milton and Burke. Choice selection and well judged. Indeed we learn much of deep interest out of that book of Parker, concerning the Chotean talks; and these talks we have never tired of reading, because of their rare and intelligent criticism. Had Parker kept up this recording upon all kinds of subjects he would have made Choate famous. One chapter of conversation almost redeems Parker's books. This chapter shows that Choate was ever studying and talking about eloquence and great writers. He was absorbed by the reading of the first geniuses of our language. He also had a familiarity with the best French productions, and finally studied German with one of his daughters, that he might make a wider examination in literature. How far he mastered the German and its literature does not appear, though it is known that he read the great German thinkers in their native tongue. Thus his studies took a wide scope, for with him to know a language was to master its great works, as his opportunity allowed. So Choate brought to his advocacy the large studies of many years, for he was rich with the spoils of all time; and these spoils are poured out in his orations with a generous copiousness.

Indeed, the eulogium upon Webster is pronounced by Everett the greatest of its kind in our language; and it must be allowed to be worthy of this praise for the amplitude of its utterance, its characterization and analysis. It will remain for ages as the only oration worthy of Webster's greatness, while Theodore Parker's will go down to posterity as a brilliant but unjust accusation of his fame. Choate seized upon the accusations of Parker and he tore them to pieces. It involved no less a problem than the duties of a statesman to the State when in peril. Here is the best ethical vindication of Mr. Webster's course that has ever been written; and from Choate's standpoint it is a masterpiece of reason and eloquence.

His addresses upon literary occasions show that he was a scholar equal to such demands, notwithstanding the exigencies of his profession. Instance his description of the lawyer who returns home to his books to recruit his drooping spirits from his arduous toil, after a week's trial, shattered in nerves, with temples throbbing, pale with anxiety about the verdict, disappointed in the charge of the judge, recalling with dread and self-disparagement the brilliant effort of his antagonist, and tormenting himself with the vain wish that he could have replied to it, and being then altogether a very miserable subject, and in as unfavorable a condition to accept comfort from wife and children as poor Christian in the first pages of the Pilgrim's Progress. Then he describes with what a superhuman effort he opens his books and soon is lost to all those toils and disappointments of some great cause when the poets come to sing and the great orators to refresh him with the charms of their genius. So he says, "Let the case of a busy lawyer testify to the priceless value of the love of reading. Well may he prize that endeared charm, so effectual and safe, without which the brain had long ago been chilled by paralysis, or set on fire of insanity." And "to these uses and enjoyments," he adds, speaking of the Peabody Institute, "to mental culture and knowledge and morality, the guide, the grace, the solace of labor on all fields, we dedicate this charity."

His address upon the eloquence of revolutionary periods presented new thoughts and brought him to describe the foremost speakers in the annals of time. He here depicted the misfortunes of great states, and how a Demosthenes and a Cicero toiled with all supreme orators to save their country in its last agony. Here was a genial field, and he has left this tribute to oratory and statesmanship. But his address upon the conservative force of the American bar is equally an appreciation and a tribute to his profession: it delineates the character of the profession and of its tendency to sustain the Constitution. Mr. Choate delivered this discourse in 1845, to the Cambridge Law School, and it was intended to enlighten those young men upon the necessity of stability in American institutions, and of the obligations of the profession to the country. He said the leanings of the bar are to the people and to liberty. He illustrates that by examples from the Roman, from the French and from our own and the British bar. He speaks of our organic forms, our Constitution, and declares that liberty is blended with order, and that conservation is the chief end, the largest duty and the truest glory of American statesmanship. He declares that "this is a government of laws and not of men; of reason, not of will; of justice and not of fraud; in that grand dogma of equality—equality of right, of burdens, of duty, of privileges, and of chances, which is the very mystery of our social being—this constitutes our strength, our glory." He then pronounces for the Constitution as it is, for jurisprudence substantially as it is, the general arrangements of liberty substantially as they are; and this he declares to be wise according to American wisdom. "To the conservation, then, of this general order of things," he thinks, the profession of the bar may be said to be assigned.

He finally deprecates the tendency to regard the actual will of the majority as the law of the state, as dangerous to the principle that this is a government of laws. This address considers at large the obligation of the bar to the state, and no jurist can read it without regarding Choate as one of the most enlightened members of the profession. This discourse does not deprecate reform, but he claimed that our system established by the Constitution was to be sustained as essential to all progress and order, and hence he thought the conservation of the laws was a primary object of that time. He was then a senator in Congress, and saw that the great danger of our time was disruption. Still it must be conceded that Choate by constitution was a Conservative rather than a Progressist. If he erred it was in devotion to mere advocacy of things as they are; and yet it would be difficult to except to his general views as uttered upon this occasion, as to the primal conservation of our system of laws.

We may here say that as a statesman and a successor to Webster, in 1841, in the United States Senate he always took a liberal and enlightened course upon all the questions presented in his time; and he conserved the national polity existing. Indeed, we have not thought it important to speak of him as a statesman except that he was one of the ablest speakers of his time, and was always a great power upon the hustings. He first examined a subject, and when he spoke he shed light upon it, and his historical references were always pertinent and forcible. He has left several political speeches, which are among his best. But Mr. Choate had little ambition for place, though he was one of the most brilliant speakers of his time, and resigned nearly all the great offices that he ever held except that of attorney-general. He always labored to advance Webster to the presidency; but seemed indifferent to his own political advancement. As a statesman he performed his duty and sought to keep the state from evil courses. He was the confiding friend of Webster, and nobly did he repay the confidence reposed in him. He and Webster were very playful and full of compliments to each other; and one day Webster, after some effort, found Choate, and jocosely said, "Long sought for, but worthy the search!"

It was Mr. Choate's habit to meditate and write out his speeches in advance, and quite often they were committed to memory. His arguments were always subjected to laborious preparation where the occasion permitted. Choate had a tenacious memory, and when he had prepared his argument it remained substantially in his memory, though he always spoke from copious notes that lay before him. He did not need words, but wrote to elevate and give force to his style. Everett could read over an address two or three times and then repeat it nearly verbatim. Calhoun prepared all his speeches with great ease, and seldom spoke in the Senate what had not been considered and shaped in his study. Webster usually spoke from full notes in which the skeleton of the speech was developed, and all statistical statements and quotations set down. He generally relied upon the moment for language and the construction of sentences; but occasionally, when he wished to make a passage especially strong and impressive, it was written out at full length. Hamilton wrote out the argument in the Croswell case beforehand, and then tore it up and spoke off-hand before the court; and Choate said that was the true way, thus implying that he did not commit to memory his written arguments.

Mr. Choate had a habit of study, which he did not confine to his law briefs, of bringing about him all the books connected with any given subject of investigation, and bringing them all to bear in enlightening his own understanding. This thoroughness of study characterized his whole life, and he never was known to squander time on useless investigation.

Rufus Choate is thus one of the great men to be studied: for his varied talents and diverse attainments in law, in literature, in statesmanship, as well as his genius as an advocate, place him among the few marvellous men of our time; and had he possessed a pure taste he would have long remained the Erskine of the American bar, in spite of the great claims of other advocates. Certainly Pinkney held the first place at the American bar thirty years before Choate became the great New England advocate, and nearly twenty after Wirt won his renown. Indeed, we may say that Choate's fame was mainly won at the Boston bar, as that of those eminent lawyers, O'Conor, Stoughton, Evarts and Brady, was at the bar of New York. Wirt, Pinkney, and Webster achieved their fame in this more famous tribunal upon great national causes in expounding the provisions of the Constitution and the sovereign claims of the particular states, while Choate gained his great fame as an advocate in local controversies. So Choate never had that great opportunity of an impeaching trial of a President to show his powers as an advocate, or a cause to display his great and solid attainments in constitutional law, and hence he was never seen by the nation at his true worth. In this sense we may say that he won as great a fame as a lawyer, with less opportunities than nearly all the great jurists who preceded him. It must be said that in the trial of a cause before a panel of twelve men he had no superior in this country. He united the calm convincing logic and acumen of O'Conor with the persuasive power of Hoffman, and it is not doubted that he possessed more general learning and accomplishments than almost any American advocate.

Choate laid his fame on that foundation so happily expressed by Bolingbroke when he pronounced in what way the great lawyer must rise to fame, and in which he said: "There have been lawyers that were orators, philosophers, historians, there have been Bacons and Clarendons; there will be none such any more, till, in some better age, true ambition or love of fame prevails over avarice, and till men find leisure and encouragement to prepare themselves for the exercise of this profession by climbing up to the vantage-ground—so my Lord Bacon calls it—of science, instead of grovelling all their lives below in a mean but gainful application to all the little arts of chicanery. Till this happens the profession of the law will scarce deserve to be ranked among the learned professions; and whenever it happens, one of the vantage-grounds to which men must climb is metaphysical and the other historical knowledge." Bolingbroke adds, "that they must pry into the secret recesses of the human heart and become well acquainted with the whole moral world, that they may discover the abstract reason of all laws; and they must trace the laws of particular states, especially of their own, from the first causes or occasions that produced them, through all the effects, good or bad, that they produced."

Choate came up to this high standard except he confined his legal researches to the common law of England, and did not trace the civil laws which obtain in nearly all Europe, and which have grown out of Roman jurisprudence. Aside from this, he comprehended the needs of a higher professional life, and laid the foundations of his fame in jurisprudence, metaphysics, and historical knowledge. He studied every master in these departments of thought. Indeed, he went farther and comprehended all of value that was within his reach in ethics, poetry and oratory. His range was wide and thorough in English, Latin, and Greek literature; and he understood and read the French, German and Hebrew. His rule was to think of at least six synonyms before he wrote the word, and thus he came to possess the greatest range of expression, and improved his ample style. To this end he always wrote down what he could during a trial, that he might attain a perfect style of prose, and he often wrote out his law points in the same manner, though he was not so ill an artist as to venture to read his speeches. Choate threw avarice to the winds, and sought fame and renown in his profession. He laid his fame on the solid base of jurisprudence and in his attainments as a lawyer. But he did not esteem his knowledge and mastery of the law and all literature sufficient for the advocate. He early put himself in the most thorough training for advocacy, not only by forming his style of speaking, but he vehemently pursued the study of letters subordinated to law. He did not stop at rhetoric and logic in his system of preparation, for he practised rhetoric through a whole life as a critical study. He would take some author, and read a page aloud, but not noisily, in his room, struggling to accomplish two things—to get the whole *feeling* of every sentence, and to express it by his tones even more passionately than the author by his words; and also he labored to "get his throat open," as he expressed it. Edmund Burke he recommended for this exercise. He held manner of as much importance as matter, and hence elocution must be exacting, even the emphasis and the cadences are to be severely attended to. He held earnestness to be the first essential quality in delivery.

Mr. Choate, as we have said, did not bring his action to perfection, nor did his person at first inspire us with the majesty of his eloquence. He finally said that speeches should be pre-written that we may be sure that we get to the bottom of our subject, and that was the only sure way to master it, and that by this preparation we cannot break down, and thus we can know the precise relation of the whole to each part of the argument. He said that the speech should be well memorized, so that the matter would lie easily and fully in the mind for immediate use.

Such is but an imperfect outline of the character of Rufus Choate. He who won the most desperate causes in the arena of the forum refused to take the side of Dr. Webster, because he would not admit the killing of Dr. Parkman; and had this admission been made, trusting to the circumstances of provocation, Mr. Choate would have satisfied a jury that it was no murder, but the killing of a human being in the heat of passion. We allude to this to show that the great American advocate then at the bar declined to defend Dr. Webster upon his own grounds, and Dr. Webster was found guilty of murder. We take leave of Mr. Choate, by saying that he was genial and kind in all the relations of life, giving his advocacy to the poor and the destitute with no reference to the fee, and always maintained the kindest relations with the bench and bar. Besides, he was chivalrous in his love of country, and boldly discharged all his duties to it as a citizen.

Art. III.—1. *A Manual of American Literature: A Text-book for Schools and Colleges.* By John S. Hart, LL. D., Professor of Rhetoric and of the English Language and Literature in the College of New Jersey, and late Principal of the New Jersey State Normal School. 12mo. pp. 641. Eldridge & Brother: Philadelphia. 1872.

2. *A Manual of English Literature: A Text-book for Schools and Colleges.* By John S. Hart, LL. D., etc., etc., etc. 12mo. pp. 636. Eldridge & Brother: Philadelphia. 1872.

3. *A Hand-book of English Literature.* Intended for the Use of High Schools, as well as a Companion and Guide for Private Students and for General Readers. By Francis H. Underwood, A.M. *American Authors.* 12mo., pp. 640. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham. 1872.

An author to whom the learned Porson had given some valuable literary assistance, said to him, "I wish to make you a public acknowledgment in the next edition of my work." "I decline your offer," said Porson; "for you may say something in compliment to me that we may both be ashamed of ten years hence."

It would be difficult to find two persons regarding themselves as public instructors more different from each other than Porson and Hart. If the latter, and scores of those whom he has eulogized in his "Manual of American Literature," be not ashamed at this moment, it is because their stomachs are strong indeed. None possessed of any taste, not blinded by vanity, who accompany us for half an hour will deny this; for so full is the book of coarse, vulgar and ridiculous puffery, that had we not carefully examined it, we could not have believed that any sane man could offer such a bundle of fustian as "A Text-book for Schools and Colleges."

This, we are quite aware, must seem harsh on our part; but we have not the least disposition to give any needless pain either to the compiler or his publishers. Our readers are aware that there has scarcely been a number of our journal issued within the last three years without a criticism on some "Reader," "Speaker," "Elocutionist," or "Manual," which depended chiefly on its puffery of literary and educational nonentities for its success. We give Mr. Hart's book more prominence than the rest, not certainly because it deserves more consideration, but because it shows more effrontery and more of the trafficking, huckster-like spirit, and is more calculated to vitiate the taste of the young and thoughtless, by giving them false notions of literature.

According to Johnson, Webster, Worcester, Brande and Smart, literature is the "result of *learning*, *knowledge* and imagination preserved in writing." These recognized authorities tell us that, as distinguished from science, "literature comprehends languages, particularly Greek and Latin," etc. Hence, "the *literati*" means "the learned," and "a literary man," "one of the *literati*." But, according to Mr. Hart, all the correspondents as well as the editors of our village newspapers, all the manufacturers of Fourth of July orations—at least all who are willing to reciprocate his eulogies—belong to our literati, no matter how illiterate they really are, or how imperfect is their knowledge even of the vernacular tongue. In short, it will be seen, as we proceed, that we indulge in no exaggeration when we say that those who take Mr. Hart's "Manual of American Literature" as a guide must regard the above definitions of Webster, Johnson, Brande, etc., as reversed, and in future define literature as "the results of *cacöethes scribendi*, vanity, impudence, and, above all, a disposition to pay either in meal or malt—in hard cash or 'in trade'—for the eulogies of 'Manual' compilers!"

Very often, as we have said, have we censured the tribe of puffers—those who, for a consideration, try to make giants of pigmies; but never until the present instance were we called upon to censure the compiler of a text-book who puffed himself. So far as we are aware, Mr. Hart has been the first, even among our puffers, to present the world an elaborate eulogy on himself. If any compiler would be justified in making his own performances the subject of an article in his own work, we might expect to find such an article in a cyclopædia or biographical dictionary; but we never have. In no other work extant are there so many names of authors, English and American, as in Alibone's Dictionary, but if the compiler has said one word about his own "works" in it we have failed to see it. Professor Lieber has no article on himself in the Encyclopædia Americana. Messrs. Ripley and Dana have been equally forgetful of themselves in their New American Cyclopædia. But we might examine every work having any pretension to respectability, hitherto published, and not find one that is equal in this respect to Mr. Hart's "Manual." As for the compilers or authors of English, French or German cyclopædias, biographical dictionaries, or manuals of literature, we know of no instance in which they are self-eulogistic.

But in the pantheon of Mr. Hart, that gentleman himself is one of the principal deities. First, he gives us a full biography, then a list of his works, with their exact size, number of pages, etc. He tells us, among other things equally interesting, how the parents of the future compiler "settled in the woods two miles above where Scranton now stands." "At the Wilkesbarre Academy he *fitted* for College." "In 1844, he edited the 'Pennsylvania Common School Journal.'" "On selling out the 'Sunday School Times,' to go to Trenton, in 1862, he was retained as Senior Editor, and he continued to write the leading editorials of that paper, weekly, to the close of 1871." (!) In the catalogue of his "works" he includes the performance now under consideration, and "Prayers for the School Room, in preparation." Not content with all this, he informs us, that his Annual Reports "fill more than three thousand closely printed pages." We may remark, in passing, that when his "Prayers" are published, we should like to find among them some such as the following: "From vanity, long-windedness, the puffing mania, bad taste, bad grammar, charlatanism, etc., etc., good Lord deliver us!"

It is almost superfluous to say that one who can be thus minute in describing his own acquirements, qualifications and productions, for the benefit of "schools and colleges," without blushing, need not be expected to blush in describing those of others who evince a proper appreciation of his skill and discretion in that sort of work. Accordingly no auctioneer is more unsparing or more equable in his praise than Mr. Hart; and, like the auctioneer, it is by no means what deserves praise most, but what needs it most, and will pay most for it, that is most highly and most elaborately praised by our compiler.

But before we attempt to illustrate this, let us view Mr. Hart's qualifications in another light. Accompanying the book under consideration we receive several pamphlets, each descriptive of the surpassing merits of one of the many "works" included in the wonderful catalogue alluded to above. The *brochures*, also, are very much in the auctioneering style. In each we are told that the author is "a teacher of teachers," and that in this book "he presents the matured fruits of his life-long work in teaching this particular branch." We have not seen his treatise on "Removing Mountains" (12mo, pp. 306), but we can hardly doubt that in this also "he presents the matured fruits of his life-long work in teaching *this particular branch*" (*!*)

We confess that in examining some of Mr. Hart's "works" for the first time, not long since, it puzzled us a good deal to understand how they could be salable commodities even in the rural districts, although we were as fully aware then as we are now, that the demand for "literature" among the masses is, in general, in an inverse ratio to its worth. But Mr. Hart's publishers have kindly enlightened us on this point. They have taken so much pride in explaining their plan, that were it theirs alone, as they seem to think, we should probably say nothing to spoil it. The thing is very simple in itself, but also very ingenious. It is this: when a book of Mr. Hart's is ready, "complimentary copies" are sent to teachers, professors, common school superintendents, trustees, etc., etc., a large proportion of whom write "complimentary letters" in return for the favor. It is true that in a great many instances the writers of these letters care nothing for the books which they declare superior to all others. Indeed, it not unfrequently happens that they never extend their perusal of them beyond the title-page, save when they expect to find in them eulogies on themselves, or model quotations from their works. Except in these cases, their chief object in praising the last book received as never to be surpassed, is to find themselves paraded about in flaming circulars as authorities in literature and education; although it too often happens that if put to the test, with their life depending on the result, they could not write three consecutive sentences, in any language, grammatically or logically correct.

At all events, as soon as a sufficient number of these letters have been received, those of them that indulge most in superlatives, and express most admiration are printed in circulars as "testimonials." All who are thus liberal and enthusiastic in bestowing praise are dubbed "great educators." But as there are different degrees even of greatness, those gentlemen and ladies who distinguish themselves most by the boldness and loftiness of their praise, may expect to be rewarded by particular compliments to their "profound learning," their "genius," etc., etc., if not by something more tangible. Nay, the institutions to which they belong are made to participate in their glory. We cannot wonder if we seem to exaggerate in these remarks, yet we have not made one which is not fully illustrated in the pamphlets enclosed to us with our copy of the "Manual of American Literature." Thus, for example, we take up one bearing its title-page, "To Teachers of Composition and Rhetoric," in which we find more than eighteen closely printed pages filled with "testimonials"—those of more than one hundred and ninety "great educators" (!) In a circular supplementary to this we find some things of which the following will serve as a specimen:

> "A very remarkable tribute to its worth appears in an article in the *Michigan Teacher*, for Sept., 1872, from the pen of the well-known Prof. Moses Coit Tyler, who occupies the chair of Rhetoric and English Literature in the University of Michigan, one of the *most prosperous, progressive*, and *vigorous* institutions of *learning* in the country."

After some further observations in the same style, a quotation is given from the "very remarkable tribute." Then we are informed that, "such testimony as this cannot be passed over; it *must* have weight and influence with every teacher," etc. Of course it must! It is almost superfluous to add that "the well-known Prof. Moses Coit Tyler" occupies, with the Michigan chair, a high rank in the Hart "Manual."

All this, however, is but one form. The puffery may be said to be only in its incipient stage when the "great educators" have done their part of the work. Then comes the turn of the "appreciative" editors and correspondents. When a village editor receives a copy of a portly volume, accompanied with "testimonials" from so large a number of learned professors and teachers, his course is clear. His only idea is to be as lofty as possible in his praise. In order that he may not have to puzzle his brain too much a ready-made eulogy is generally sent him with the book. This being inserted, two purposes are supposed to be served: the author and publisher of the book have a valuable contribution to "opinions of the press," and the editor has the gratification to see his journal quoted as an authority in literature and education. Nor is this all; if he evinces proper zeal; if he does something similar once a month or so, commencing when the book goes to press, he may expect to be immortalized in the author's next performance. And since the learned professors and teachers, male and female, may reasonably calculate on their apotheosis for similar services, it can no longer seem wonderful to the curious reader, either that performances like that under consideration prove quite successful as catch-pennies, or that our American pantheon is so densely crowded!

Wonderfully prolific as the "teacher of teachers" informs us he is, this is the first time we have written a line about himself or any of his numerous "works." Even now, we must confine ourselves to the two volumes whose titles stand at the head of this article; or rather to one of them, for we can do no more than allude, in passing, to the other. It will be seen that the "Manual of American Literature," is not only as large as the "Manual of English Literature," but a little larger: it contains much more matter. But the difference is like that between the "waterfalls" of the lady and her maid of all work. Bridget, as well as her mistress, has some genuine hair in her contrivance—perhaps as good hair as the most refined and beautiful lady need wish. But in order to equal that of her mistress in size and external appearance, Bridget has to stuff hers with horse-hair, wool, flax or tow—sometimes a mixture of these different articles, the tow being, in general, the largest ingredient. As Bridget can procure tow, or perhaps pure flax, as easily as her mistress can procure genuine human hair, she sometimes thinks she may surpass her mistress, at least in the *size* of her "waterfall."

We do not say that Mr. Hart has reasoned like Bridget, for we have a thousand assurances that the "teacher of teachers" has no rival in the logic of mixtures; but that he has expanded his "Manual of American Literature" with ingredients which exactly correspond, metaphorically, with those used by Bridget for a similar purpose, will be readily admitted by every impartial reader possessed of taste and discernment who takes the trouble to examine that curious book. We are not at all disposed, therefore, to contradict Mr. Hart when he says, in his preface: "It is not only *original in its conception*, *form* and *structure*, but it has *in its materials*, also, to a greater extent than is usual in such works, the character of *originality*." If it be not an original idea to rank as "literary men" hundreds of illiterate scribblers—nay, to devote two-thirds of a thick volume in the smallest type used in books to the merest rubbish, and style the *tout ensemble* a "Manual of *Literature*," we should like to know what idea is original, in the modern acceptation of the term. This may seem harsh, but let us proceed.

Those privileged to use the work as "a Text-book for Schools and Colleges" receive full and particular directions in an article "To Teachers." The following will serve as a specimen of the instructions given in this department by the "teacher of teachers:"

> "2. Study carefully, *in full*, one *leading author* in each Chapter or Section, either taking the author who is named in the book as standing at the head of that Section, or selecting some other, at the discretion of the teacher."

It will presently be seen what sort of "authors" are to be studied thus carefully, and how easy it must be to make a selection in so large a crowd. Thus, for example, no other country in the world can boast such a number of living poets, male and female. Our living novelists are still more numerous. Then, in the departments of history, biography, theology, etc., etc., the most patriotic of our readers, and those having most faith in the "march of intellect," will find ample reason to boast—at least, so far as numbers and eulogies may be taken as a criterion of intellectual worth and wealth. For our own part, although we have hitherto flattered ourselves that we were tolerably familiar with American literature, we must confess—though perhaps not without blushing—that there are quite a formidable number of our poets, novelists, historians, biographers, scientists, etc., etc., of whose very existence we had been ignorant, before their "works" and other *res gestæ* were brought to our attention in the matchless volume under consideration. We cannot pretend to wonder, then, that, even while immortalizing so many of the correspondents of western newspapers, stock actresses, fourth of July village orators, etc.,

etc., the "teacher of teachers" frequently reminds us triumphantly of the ancient, impudent query, "Who reads an American book?" Would it not be much more reasonable to ask now, in view of the grand and imposing array of genius and learning furnished us by Mr. Hart, "Who reads an English book?" But, perhaps, a more appropriate query than either would be, "Who will *not* read our new 'Text-book for Schools and Colleges?'" for Mr. Hart says in his instructions "To Teachers," "*Scholars while passing through the book* should be advised and encouraged to read *all the matter* in its connection." One would think that no "scholar" would need any such advice or encouragement!

But we are yet only in the vestibule of the great structure. Chapter I. commences thus: "American literature, *strictly speaking*, is that part of English literature *which has been produced upon American soil.*" This is a capital piece of information to commence with! Is it not just as sensible to say, "The American people, strictly speaking, are that portion of the English people who have been *produced* on American soil?" or "American geese are, strictly speaking, that portion of the English genus *anseres* produced on American soil?" Is the literature of the Brazilians, or of the Mexicans, "English literature"? since it must be admitted that Brazil and Mexico are as truly "American soil" as the Canadas, or even the United States. But our author settles the point in a "Note," telling us that "A literature is *denominated* from the language in which it is written." Then there is no such thing as American literature, except we call our dialect the American language. The Brazilians boast that they have a literature, but they are mistaken. They may learn from the "teacher of teachers," that what they call their literature is that part of Portuguese literature "produced on American soil," since their language is the Portuguese. The Mexicans labor under a similar mistake when they boast that they have any such thing as a Mexican literature.

The truth is that Mr. Hart has not learned in all his boasted enormous experience in teaching teachers the simple obvious fact that a literature is "denominated *not* from the language in which it is written," but from the people or nationality that have chiefly produced it. It is true that our author has an example for his style of derivation in the common habit of designating all potatoes that are not "sweet," "Irish potatoes." We do not know that Irishmen make any particular objection to this, although they may think that the tuber "produced" in this country is not quite so succulent, mealy, and palatable as that produced in "ould Ireland;" but we suspect that our English cousins will urge some strong objections before recognizing nine-tenths of the sort of literature lauded to the skies by Mr. Hart, as forming any other part of "English literature" than its dross or scum.

It is needless for us to assure our readers that none have higher respect for our real literary men and literary women than we; none set a higher value on all that is worthy of the name of American literature. We yield to none in our appreciation of those of our poets, novelists, historians, orators, scientists, and educators, who have any just claim to be ranked as such. There are those belonging to each department whom we regard as worthy of comparison with the greatest authors of modern times in their own respective fields. But it is these who, in general, receive least attention from Mr. Hart. Thus, for example, he has far more to say of himself than of William H. Prescott, John Lothrop Motley, and George Ticknor, each of whom is everywhere recognized as occupying the first rank among modern historians. Nay, he tells us more about himself in his American "Manual" than he tells us about some of the most renowned intellects of England in his English "Manual;" more than he does, for instance, about Hume, Horne Tooke, Sir William Jones, Bolingbroke, Richard Brinsley Sheridan, Lord Chesterfield, or Charles James Fox, etc. In his American "Manual" the living receive tenfold the attention which is bestowed on the dead. This may be easily understood from the fact that half the whole book is devoted to the period "from 1850 to the present time." Byron speaks of "the mob of gentlemen who write;" but we have here what may well be called "the swell mob," for it includes all who have bestowed a certain amount of bombastic praise on the "teacher of teachers."

We are very unwilling to give samples of the sort of writers set down as men of letters and women of letters. We would abstain from doing so if we deemed it possible consistently with the due performance of our duty as a critic. But it is not possible. In such circumstances general remarks have little effect. The most illiterate and most vulgar "authors" would be the last to believe that it was they who were alluded to in the language of scorn or ridicule. It is unavoidable, then, to mention a few of those immortalized by Mr. Hart. Nor is there any good reason why they should object to our doing so, but the contrary, since, be it remembered, a part of our author's plan has been to receive into his pantheon all who have done the handsome thing for him with their own estimate of their merits! To a large number, however, it will be disagreeable to say that it is those who are most ambitious to figure as "authors" that have least claim to any such title; and that they bear about the same relation to authors worthy of the name which those who send their names and dollars to the "society" papers in order to have their "movements" duly proclaimed, bear to true gentlemen and ladies. The spurious authors, like the spurious ladies and gentlemen, long to be "noticed" in their assumed character even by Jenkins; and each are quite as willing to purchase eulogies of the sort which suits their taste as they are to purchase butter or molasses. Real ladies and gentlemen feel that they have no need of the services of Jenkins in order to secure recognition, as such, among the classes whose recognition they value. Accordingly, it is well known that instead of courting his attention they do their best to avoid him, and are much more mortified than pleased when he bespatters them with his praise in common with the most vulgar pretenders. And need we say that it is the highest class of men of letters, poets, philosophers, and historians, who in all ages have evinced a similar feeling?

Now, before we attempt to indicate the sort of materials with which Mr. Hart has stuffed more than half his "Manual," whether through motives of pure patriotism or a desire to sell as many copies as possible, we will take a brief glance at the class of authors who have evinced least ambition for biographies. It is only the few who devote themselves to the obscure records of the past that are aware of how many great authors, artists, discoverers and inventors have passed away without leaving behind them as much as their name. We are not even told that they were born one day and died another. Of the several great epics which are the glory of Sanscrit literature the author of one is not known, although each has been attributed to several. Have not scores of volumes been written to prove that no such individual as Homer ever lived? That Shakespeare has lived is, indeed, beyond dispute. The great dramatist wrote at too recent a period to render it possible to doubt this fact.

But what else do we know about Shakespeare, further than we learn from his works? And how much do we know, by any other means, of Virgil? How much of Juvenal, the greatest of Roman satirists? The greatest of the Greek satirists was undoubtedly Lucian; but, precisely because he was the greatest, most resolute, most courageous, and most honest, not a word should we have known about him had his admirable and invaluable works perished. In short, of all ancient biographers, the only one who mentions him is Suidas, and the chief piece of information he gives in regard to him is, that he was "torn by dogs as a fit punishment for his impiety," etc. Philostratus was the chief puffer in Lucian's time, Greek culture having sadly degenerated in the second century of our era. Philostratus was a person without learning or taste, but of an ambitious and thrifty disposition. He compiled a book, remarkably similar to Mr. Hart's "Manual of American Literature," entitled, "Lives of the Sophists." With the exception of three or four, those who receive attention in this work were mere nonentities; although it must be confessed that the most ignorant and most stupid of them had juster claims to the character of "men of letters," than three-fourths of Mr. Hart's "living authors." At all events, the name of Lucian—by far the greatest thinker and author of the period—is not as much as mentioned by

Philostratus! But those acquainted with the works of the philosopher, critic, and satirist of Samosata, fully understand the reason. For the benefit of those who do not possess that advantage, we quote what, in modern parlance, might be called the platform of Lucian: "I am the declared enemy of *all false pretences, all quackery, all lies and all false puffing*, and hate from the bottom of my heart all and every one who belongs to *that infamous tribe*, including, as you know full well, a mighty host."*

It is now high time that we give some specimens of Mr. Hart's men and women of letters. We might have done so much sooner, but were in no hurry to perform so disagreeable a task. Even now, we wish to deal as gently with that "mighty host" as the nature of their cases will allow; for although their "biographies" are chiefly their own estimates of themselves, the most ambitious and least cultivated of them are not so much to blame as the person who had so execrable a taste, and so grovelling a soul, as to permit himself to become the sycophant of such a tribe.

Entering the new wing of the Hart pantheon, the first "author" we happen to meet is Sylvanus Cobb, author of "The Cat that didn't eat the Rat," and innumerable other productions of a similar character. This renowned "man of letters" was, it seems, born in 1823, and is a native of Maine. Although he has written for various country papers, he had not achieved immortality until he created a sensation in the New York Ledger, or rather among the chambermaids and sewing-girls, who are delighted with such productions as "The Gunmaker of Moscow." "Some twenty or thirty novelettes," (dime novels) says Mr. Hart, "have been republished from his newspaper stories" (p. 490). Side by side with Sylvanus Cobb stands Francis Henry Stauffer. Philadelphia has the honor of having given birth to Mr. Stauffer, in common with a host of other celebrities of similar calibre who figure in the

---

* *"Μισαλαζών είμι, και μισογόης, και μισοψευδὴς, και μισοτυφος, και μισῶ πᾶν τὸ τοιουτωδες εἶδος τῶν μιαρῶν ἀνθρωών· πάνυ δὲ πολλοί εισιν, ὡς οἶσθα."—ΑΑΕΙΥΣ, ΗΑΝΑΒΙΟΥΝΤΕΣ.* **Luciani Opera, Ed. Lehman, tom. iii. § 20.**

"Manual." Stauffer's high position as a literary man is placed beyond dispute by Mr. Hart as follows:

> "He has been for several years a contributor to *the literary journals*. At present he is an *exclusive* contributor to the Saturday Night. His best serials in that journal have been the following: Ruth Brandon, or the Wrecker's Daughter; Fidelia, the Fire Waif; Lucy Darrel; The False Cousin; Dorlan the Scout; Devona the Dauntless; Kate Walsingham, or Life in Bradbury Court.
>
> "Mr. Stauffer is a resident of Philadelphia." (!)

How fortunate the "Saturday Night" has been in securing so brilliant a genius as an "exclusive contributor!" But it is still more fortunate, perhaps, in attracting the "notice" of the "teacher of teachers." Indeed, newspapers in general may well feel grateful to Mr. Hart. Take the Tribune, for example, and see how many of its editors and correspondents he has immortalized. His long biography of Albert D. Richardson, alone, ought to secure for him the strongest recommendations for each of his numerous "works," not excepting his treatise on "Removing Mountains;" for our author has bestowed nearly as much admiration on Mr. Richardson as he has on himself, at least nearly as many lines and words. This curious biography ends thus:

> "Mr. Richardson died December 2, 1869, having been shot in the Tribune office by Mr. Daniel McFarland. A volume has since been published, called Garnered Sheaves, containing a selection from Mr. Richardson's Miscellaneous writings, and a Memoir."

This article ought to be sufficient to prove by itself that the "Manual" has a high claim as "a text-book for schools and colleges." Be it understood, that among the directions "To Teachers" is, "study carefully, in full, one leading author in each chapter or section," etc. It is clear that by following this advice neither young gentlemen nor young ladies can fail to discover excellent models for imitation in the "Manual of American Literature." It is a curious fact that the numerous biographies of journalists are long or short, according as their subjects are known to appreciate or despise such things. Thus it is very evident, for example, that neither George D. Prentice, George Ripley, Charles A. Dana, Morton

McMichael, or Samuel Bowles, has furnished any eulogy on himself. Need we say that it is on the same principle our author does not so much as mention editors like Charles G. Green, of the Boston Post, and Daniel N. Haskell, of the Boston Transcript. Such of the assistants or correspondents of any of these journalists as possess least ability and least culture are much more likely than themselves to call brass gold and tow silk. Accordingly the assistants and correspondents figure as giants in Mr. Hart's pantheon, while the real journalists, those whose abilities and culture are beyond dispute, figure only as pigmies, or are altogether excluded from that curious edifice.

It is true that editors-in-chief have honors conferred on them *ex officio*, in another way, lest they might sometimes spoil "first-rate notices," by treating them as wanting *fire*. Sufficient illustrations of this may be found in almost any page of our author's "copious index," such, for instance, as "Commercial Bulletin, by Charles Guild," "Springfield Republican, by Samuel Bowles," "Sun, New York, by Charles A. Dana," "North American Newspaper, by Morton McMichael." In conferring this sort of honor also, our author takes care to remember himself, for we read in the index, "Sunday School Times, by John S. Hart." Thus, in future, we have as good a right to say, "The Daily Thunderbolt, by Smith," as we have to say the *Divina Commedia* by Dante, Hiawatha by Longfellow, or Thanatopsis by Bryant. .

As might be expected, those who have particularly distinguished themselves by their kind opinions of the "teacher of teachers" are particularly honored even in his index. Thus, for instance, his great Aristarchus is James Ward Davidson. The opinion of either Aristotle or Longinus on either poetry or prose is of little importance compared to that of Mr. Davidson, for we read:

"*Davidson*, James Ward, 394; his opinion of Gen. Hill, 407; of Mrs. Augusta E. Wilson, 506; of Sue Petigru King, 504; of W. H. Peck, 481; of Charles Dimitry, 482; of P. H. Hayne, 370; of Mrs. Fanny M. Downing, 357; of Professor Bledsoe, 563; of Helper, 549; of Miss Dupuy, 508; of Mrs. McLeod, 508."

In each of these instances, so far as we have been able to examine, a direct quotation is given from Mr. James Ward Davidson, and his name affixed to it in full just as the names of newspapers are to numerous similar things in the same work. If instead of "opinion of —— of —— of ——" etc., etc., Mr. Hart had said "*puff* of —— of——," etc., etc., then things would have been called, at least in one instance, by their proper names. But let the curious reader turn to Mr. Davidson's biography, which, like so many others, concludes thus: "He is at present a resident of Washington, D. C." Mr. Hart rarely forgets that an advertisement should include the address of the party advertised; doubtless, when he omits the address, there is good reason for the omission.

It is a curious fact that, although there are several others who are each declared superior to all others, as critics, none are quoted like Mr. Davidson. Turning to James Russell Lowell, we are told, that gentleman "*excels in so many lines of effort* that it is not easy to know in what class of writers to place him. * * * His latest and *most consummate* efforts, however, as given in the two volumes * * *seem to point to literary criticism* as that in which he has *achieved his greatest success.*" Yet, so far as we have been able to see, Mr. Lowell's "opinion" is nowhere quoted by Mr. Hart. Is it because his opinion of such "authors" as four-fifths of those eulogized in the present "Manual" is not favorable? Is it, in short, because whatever may be the faults of Mr. Lowell, he is a critic, not a puffer? It is evident that although he has received abundant praise, such as it is, from Mr. Hart, he has not furnished his biography to that gentleman. Otherwise the grammar and style of the thing would have been much better than they are. And we think we are quite safe in arriving at the same conclusion in regard to the biography of Oliver Wendell Holmes. He, too, we are told, "*excels in several departments.* He is by profession a medical lecturer, and ranks high as a writer on medical science, *producing, on one occasion, three* prize dissertations in *two successive years*"(!) This, it will be admitted, was a wonderful feat. Will the reader please admire the grammar, and the common sense of the compliment, and then turn to Miss Edgeworth's Essay on Bulls. Surely Dr. Holmes will prove himself very ungrateful if he fails to assign a high rank to the "teacher of teachers," as a biographer, philologist and critic. But we suspect that, in spite of his skill as a physician, his stomach is not strong enough for the effort.

The same, but slightly modified, may be said of the plastering process to which Dr. R. Shelton Mackenzie has been subjected by the same artist, and of its effects on the Doctor's stomach. But that gentleman is far too good-natured to blame one who has been equally eulogistic of him in his "English Literature" and "American Literature," although it may remind him that when a certain deputation of ladies presented Dr. Johnson a rather high-flown eulogistic address, the honest lexicographer and critic only replied, "Fiddle da dee, my dears!" Thus, in "English Literature" we are informed that Dr. Maginn is a native of Ireland; and we are informed in "American Literature" that Dr. Mackenzie is a native of the same country. But mark. In the biography of the former we read as follows: "The service which Maginn's *countrymen failed to render him* has been rendered by *an American*—R. Shelton Mackenzie, LL.D., etc." Dr. Mackenzie is not one of Maginn's "countrymen," although Mr. Hart himself informs us in "American Literature" that he was "born in Limerick County, Ireland, and educated *at a school* in Fermoy," that "at the age of thirteen he was apprenticed to an apothecary in Cork;" that "he studied medicine, and obtained *on examination* the degree of M. D.," and finally, "that he opened a school in Fermoy" (p. 419). Since, notwithstanding all this, Mackenzie is "an American," it is clear that Maginn's countrymen are an ungrateful, unappreciative race!

Be this as it may, had our author only rendered himself ridiculous by his bombastic, self-contradictory eulogies on men who, as in the three or four instances just given, have undoubted claims to the character of literary men, we would have laid his book aside, with scores of its class, as a harmless though worthless performance. But, as already remarked, it is those who deserve no praise, but the reverse, in whose praise he is most enthusiastic; it is to those who have no rank in literature he assigns the highest rank. And his favorite literary women are just like his favorite literary men. We know as little, personally, of Mrs. Southworth as we do of Mr. Ward Davidson, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Stauffer or any other "author" we have mentioned as belonging to Mr. Hart's *literati*. We have not the least feeling against one or another, or the least disposition to disparage the efforts of any, further than our duty as a critic seems to require. Of the efforts of the ladies especially, we would much rather speak in the language of approbation than in that of censure; but we must remember that those who praise the productions of all who wear female garments praise none. It is unjust to those who exercise a refining influence on society, and aid in elevating the public taste by their works, to bestow superlative praise on those whose works have notoriously the opposite tendency.

It is only in the latter light, we regret to say, we have been able to regard the novels of Mrs. Southworth, although we have no reason to doubt that in private life she is an estimable lady. We have to do only with her character and rank as an author. Mr. Hart commences his biography of the lady by the somewhat equivocal compliment that, "since that time she has devoted herself with unflagging energy to the work of production." First, the lady's genius is illustrated by Mr. Hart, then by herself; so that we have both a biography and an autobiography of Mrs. Southworth in the "Manual," as we have of so many others who have adorned our literature in a similar manner. The lady is so communicative as to give us such particulars as the following: "My school numbered eighty pupils, boys and girls, and I had the whole charge of them myself." "I was attacked with frequent hemorrhage of the lungs." "But look how it terminated." Here follows a piece of fine writing. Finally the great first book was written, and, more wonderful still, it was "accepted by the first publishing house in America,"—that of Peterson, we suppose. This, however, is but a part of the climax, and even of the sentence in which Peterson is elevated above all others of "the trade"(!) The remaining clause is, that the book "was published, and (*subsequently*) noticed, with high favor, even by the cautious English reviewers."

It is important to know that, subsequently to its publication, it was "noticed with high favor," etc. It seems that the "cautious English reviewers" do not eulogize even such great works as "Retribution" before they see them! We must admit it is natural enough that an author having a publisher who has his "opinions of the press" manufactured in his own office, and furnished in printed form to editors and correspondents, should regard a "first-rate notice," given after her book is published, as evidence of peculiar merit.

Mr. Hart's next great authoress "achieved her chief distinction," he informs us, "as an actress" (p. 497). To this he adds, that "she won laurels also as a writer." Then follows the usual biography. We quote the closing paragraph:

> "In 1860 she was called to New York to attend her dying father, and for weeks she devoted her whole time to nursing him. His death left her in such a *prostrate* condition *that she went to Europe* to regain her health, *first with a sister living in Paris, then with another sister in Rome, after that in Florence.*"

The reader will please admire the grammar, common sense and perspicuity of the last sentence. One who was so "prostrate" that she went to Europe, must have been in a state of prostration happily not often experienced! But how did she go thither three times in such a condition? Was it the same sister who was in Rome and in Florence? or were there three sisters? Who can tell from the language of the teacher of teachers?

We turn over a page or two and read a biography of another lady. Then we are presented with the estimate of "one who is well acquainted with her." We are informed by this discreet person that her works are "read *with toleration*, if not with positive delight, in England" (p. 500). No doubt they are read in France, too, and probably in Germany, "with toleration!"

Our author tries hard to satisfy Mrs. Stowe, but he finds himself in the position of the rustic lover, who having exhausted all his fine compliments on his lady's waiting-maid found that in order to make the necessary distinction, and extend his speech to the prescribed length, he had to praise the lady's nose for its large size! In illustration of this we transcribe a paragraph from the affair on Mrs. Stowe:

> "In 1869, in consequence of the publication of the Countess Guiccioli's Recollections of Byron, and the attempt *in various quarters* not only *to glorify the poet*, but to disparage the memory of Lady Byron, Mrs. Stowe undertook to *vindicate the latter*, in a book called The True Story of Byron's Life. It led to a fierce and *most intemperate* discussion."

"To glorify the poet" was, of course, very wrong, especially as the "attempt" was made "in various quarters;" and, since it was still worse "to disparage the memory of Lady Byron," it was entirely right to hold the poet responsible, and assail him in his grave as no man had ever before been assailed by a woman! The disgust and indignation expressed in public and private by every decent man and woman, at seeing the grave of the illustrious dead thus befouled, are denounced by the "teacher of teachers" as a "most intemperate discussion." (!) There was nothing "intemperate" or improper in unblushingly attempting to cast infamy on the memory of Lord Byron and of his sister; on the contrary, it was a praiseworthy performance!

But another word in regard to Mr. Hart's *literati*. Turning over a few pages we find that a bookseller of New York, who is very skilful in getting off unsalable books, and who sometimes allows himself to be persuaded to put his imprint on such, especially if they have a certain air of sanctity about them, has written "beautiful lyrics." Accordingly he is, of course, entitled to a niche in the new pantheon. In general our *literati* have "gone West" as soon as their genius began to develop. But it was otherwise ordered in the case of our lyrical bookseller. Mr. Hart informs us that, "At the age of *four* he *went* to New York, and has lived there ever since" (p. 372). It will be admitted that this was nearly as great a feat as that of the lady who was so prostrate that she went to Europe in so mysterious a way. That one who went to seek his fortune "at the age of four" should prove highly gifted, is nothing more than the most stupid might have predicted. There is a peculiar fitness, therefore, in favoring the readers of "A Manual of American Literature: A Text-book for Schools and Colleges," as Mr. Hart has done, with some specimens of those "beautiful lyrics." Only two are given, both about "Our Baby." In order to show what gems these are, it is only necessary to quote the opening lines of the first:

> "Of all the darling children
> That ever a household blessed,
> We place our baby for compare
> With the fairest and the best."

Such is the overwhelming pathos of the second "lyric," that we would advise our readers not to meddle with it, at least until they have undergone the preparation of perusing a score or two of the "poetical" obituaries in some village newspaper. But "Our Baby" lyrics are by no means the only things which show how wonderfully similar are the taste and judgment of Mr. Hart to those of his great prototype the Maitre de Philosophie in *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme.* "Il n'y a que la prose ou les vers?" asks Monsieur Jourdain. "Non, Monsieur. *Tout ce qui n'est point prose est vers, et tout ce qui ne point vers est prose.*" This, however, is by no means the only point in which the teacher of teachers may claim to be compared with Monsieur Jourdain's Maitre de Philosophie. Let the curious reader who doubts this read some of Mr. Hart's rules and directions "To teachers," and then turn to Act II, Scene vi, of the *Bourgeois Gentilhomme.* "La voix A se forme en ouvrant fort la bouche," etc, says the Maitre. "Ma foi, oui. Ah! que cela est beau!" says Monsieur. As the former waxes eloquent in his directions the latter exclaims, as no doubt a great many of Mr. Hart's pupils will, "Ah! l'habile homme que vous êtes, et que 'j' ai perdu de temps! R, R, R, Ra."

None of our various hierarchies have any reason to blame Mr. Hart for lack of appreciation of their talents as authors and orators. True, he uses more superlatives in puffing the

Presbyterian divines, especially those of the Princeton school, than he does in performing the same sort of work for others. But he is abundantly liberal of them to all—nearly as much so as he is to newspaper correspondents. The Catholics may, perhaps, complain that their authors have only received back seats in the Hart pantheon. We hear nothing of them until all others have been done for. Then they are thrown in, pell-mell, though not without being furnished each with a pretty thick coat of kalsomine or soap. Strangely enough, the exact titles of the literary "works" of Father Hecker are not given in his biography, but it is doubtless to make up for so important an omission we are informed that the good Father "entered into business there (in New York) with his brothers in the *milling and baking* establishment of Hecker Brothers." We are not told what particular sort of "milling" was done, but take it for granted it was something in the way of *grinding*. Even a "teacher of teachers," who expects his book to be used by Catholics as "a text-book for schools and colleges," must remember that the "works" of an archbishop must not be passed over so lightly as those of an humble Father. Accordingly, we have the following "full particulars" as to the claims of his grace of Cincinnati to literary fame:—

> "He had, in 1837, a seven days' controversy—an oral discussion—with Alexander Campbell, which was reported and published in a large (*sic*) volume; had also, in 1868, a written discussion with Thomas Vickers, entitled The Roman Clergy and Free Thought; and has issued numerous Pastorals."

When a western archbishop has had "a seven days' controversy," "which was *reported* and published in a *large* volume," and has besides "*issued numerous pastorals*"—above all western pastorals,—his claims to authorship can no more be disputed than those of Fenelon or Bossuet!

We observe however that in huddling the Catholic authors together at the close of his great work, Mr. Hart has made some important omissions. We have given him credit for boundless liberality, but it occurs to us, on reflection, that the only institutions of learning which he recognizes as perfect are the College of New Jersey and the Philadelphia High School. Not a word of that other great Jersey College known as Seton Hall! Still stranger if possible, he gives us no biography of the Very Rev. Father Corrigan, the president and professor of *Christian Ethics*, etc., of that institution. We might ourselves have furnished him with the titles of some of the works of that eminent educator and divine. His "Controversies" alone would fill a dozen "large volumes." But who has not heard of his Essay on Irish Potatoes, as a means of furnishing cheap board both to Irish and Cuban students? although it seems the work is not popular among the students themselves. It is otherwise, however, we are assured, in regard to his learned treatise on Billiard Playing as a necessary college preparation for "the liquor business." But we believe his *chef d'œuvre* is his "*You Lie!* A farce in three acts." This is intended however, we are assured, only for the instruction of such as are so stupid and impudent as to believe that any other Catholic college, especially any Catholic college *not* conducted by Fathers, is superior to Seton Hall, or even equal to that far-famed institution. We do not ask Mr. Hart to give this "notice" in his second edition, although we are convinced it would do more good than three-fourths of the "notices" he has given. It would certainly possess more of the element of truth, for example, than the statement that after Dr. Siliman Ives had become a Catholic, he "went back to the Episcopal Church" (p. 617).

It is evident that Archbishop Bayley has not furnished his biography, for there are a score of newspaper correspondents, male and female, any of whom is honored with a much broader and higher pedestal. As for authors like Mrs. Swisshelm, "Josh Billings," and "Artemus Ward," any of them occupies a larger space than the three most literary and most illustrious of the archbishops put together—nay, our author makes a much greater giant of himself than of the three!

Protestant bishops have not much influence in introducing text-books into "schools and colleges." Accordingly, their biographies are remarkably meagre. One "journalist," or actress, receives more than a full score of them. Instance

Bishop Williams, Bishop Lee, Bishop Stevens, Bishop Cox, Bishop Kip, etc. Thus poor Bishop Eastburn is put off with two lines, although we are told he "has published lectures on Philippians, and *a number of sermons and charges*" (!) (p. 608). Not only the Presbyterians and the Methodists, but also the Catholics receive much more credit than this for their "sermons and charges." At least, one reverend Father is honored with a niche on the ground that he "has in press an important work" (p. 619). Doubtless this gentleman has neglected to furnish his biography; he has evidently not filled up the blanks of the "teacher of teachers." Otherwise he might have received as large a pedestal and as prominent a "position" as Sylvanus Cobb or Frank H. Stauffer, or as one of the various Mrs. Smiths who have also the advantage of being "connected with the press." At least, he would have occupied as much space as Rev. Z. A. Mudge, A. M., in whose biography we find such important particulars as the following: "He *removed in childhood* to Lynn, Mass., *the native place of his parents*, where he *remained to* early manhood" (p. 492). These, however, were by no means his chief feats; for, we are told that he "joined, in 1840, the New England Conference, in which he has *itinerated*," etc., etc.

But we must take our leave at last of Mr. Hart. Although, in our necessarily hurried glance, we have been able to point out but a comparatively small part of the sycophancy, flunkyism, charlatanism, etc., etc., of the "teacher of teachers," we think it will be admitted that we indulged in no exaggeration, and did none injustice, in comparing the filling up of the "Manual of American Literature," to that used by Bridget, the chambermaid, in making her "waterfall" as large as that of her mistress. It is needless to remark to the intelligent reader—to any gentleman or lady possessed of taste or judgment, who takes the pains to examine the book—what a sad commentary it is on our educational institutions, that many of them will not only tolerate such a performance, but reciprocate its vulgar, barefaced puffery!

Mr. Underwood is by no means free from favoritism, but he is free from self-laudation, free from vulgarity, free from bad grammar, free from charlatanism. Mr. Underwood makes no pretension to superior learning—still less does he call himself a "teacher of teachers." Compared to Mr. Hart he deserves to be complimented positively for his common sense. As for evidences of culture and taste, the contrast, in that respect, between the twain is so great, that we feel justified in addressing the compiler of the "Hand Book"—

> *Tu* nihil invitâ *dices faciesve* Minervâ;
> Id *tibi judicum* est, *ea mens.**

When giving our estimate of Mr. Underwood's "Hand Book of English Authors," some months since, we paid him no such compliment as this—although we gave him credit for having evinced a judicious discrimination, and made a nearer approach to complete success, than any one else who had attempted the same task. But everybody knows that while an ordinary painting is only regarded as such by any competent judge, when it stands alone, it seems almost a *chef d'œuvre* when placed beside a daub of the village sign-board style. Still we would not slight Mr. Hart. As we apply the Roman dialect to one compiler, there is no reason why we should not, in order to be impartial, apply it to the other. Nay, we are willing to apply the same lines to Mr. Hart, but slightly modified, thus:

> *Tu* nihil *invitâ dices faciesve Mammonâ;*
> Ea *tibi ineptia* est, *ista res.*

We have remarked that Mr. Underwood is not free from favoritism. This will be found true to an extent that is sometimes amusing. Four-fifths of his great men and great women have been born in Boston, in Massachusetts, or at least not far from that region. It is only under very peculiar circumstances that immortality is conferred by Mr. Underwood on any one who had the misfortune of being born outside the circumference of that charmed circle. We will not say that, after all, a great many of his giants and giantesses are pigmies; but, certainly, there are many of his swans that are but geese—well-bred geese, in most cases, we admit—geese that cackle much more politely than our New York and New Jersey geese—but still only spurious swans! However, as we have always rather liked not only Boston and Massachusetts, but, also, some of the adjacent regions, we will pass no severe censure on Mr. Underwood for this, especially as it is the only fault his "Hand Book" has. Our readers know that an undue admiration of the text-books of the present day is not among our faults, but Mr. Underwood's book is one of the few which, while they undoubtedly bear some traces of the ruling passion of our time and country for puffery, are still to be earnestly recommended not merely to the students, parents and teachers of any particular section, party or denomination, but to all Americans who set any adequate value on culture and taste.

---

* *Ars Poet.* 385.

ART. IV.—1. *The Mathematical Principle of Natural Philosophy.* By SIR ISAAC NEWTON. 1 vol. 8vo. New York, 1848.

2. *Théorie Analytique du Système du Monde.* Par G. DE PONTECOULANT. 4 vols. 8vo, and Supplement. Paris, 1834—1856.

3 *Mathematical Tracts on the Lunar and the Planetary Perturbations.* By GEORGE BIDDELL AIRY. 1 vol. 8vo. Cambridge, 1858.

4. *Memoir on the Secular Variations of the Elements of the Orbits of the Eight Principal Planets, Mercury, Venus, the Earth, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, etc., etc.* By JOHN N. STOCKWELL, M. S., Smithsonian Institute, 1872.

THERE are few things more astonishing to the human mind than the power which algebraic signs and symbols—composed of a few marks and letters—have to represent the motion of the heavenly bodies in all time; or, in other words, to exhibit to the eye and mind the past, the present, and the future state of the system of the world. To determine at any time, by means of these formulæ, as they are called, the position of a planetary body, they must be reduced to numbers; in other words, the elements of the orbits of the bodies represented must be substituted for the algebraic symbols, the calculations indicated must be performed, and the resulting numbers will indicate the point in the heavens where, with the requisite instrument, the body may be found. A series of positions thus calculated, sufficient to represent a complete cycle of the formulæ, and arranged in order, forms planetary tables. Tables of this kind, though usually unattractive and uninteresting to the unscientific reader, are really of the highest importance as representing our knowledge of the real and apparent motions and positions of the celestial bodies; and the truthfulness with which the apparent positions are represented is a test of the degree of accuracy to which our investigations have been carried.

Tables intended to represent the motions of the celestial bodies, especially the sun and planets, consist generically, in more modern times, of two parts: the first and principal part giving the motion in a certain definite ellipse, the sun occupying one of the foci. The second part gives the amount of deviation from this ellipse, caused by the various known disturbing forces. By a comparison of the places thus calculated with the places of the heavenly bodies as actually observed, we can ascertain whether all disturbing causes, whose effects are perceptible, have been taken into consideration. The amount and direction of the deviation from the prescribed course will thus become known. These outstanding quantities, should they exist, will, in some cases, make known the law according to which they are produced, and point to the probable cause of them. These residual phenomena, as they have been called, have led to some of the most important discoveries in the whole history of astronomy.

The discovery of the requisite formulæ for the construction of astronomical tables that approximate in correctness to the degree of precision with which observations are made, has required the most profound thought in all ages of the world since astronomy became a science of calculation. Hipparchus was the first great astronomer that was able to establish a theory that enabled him to predict the places of the sun and moon with a degree of accuracy which answered the purposes of astronomy in the comparatively rude state of observation in his day. This he did by introducing the epicycle and demonstrating its value and correctness in representing the inequalities in the motions of the sun and moon.* He calculated solar and lunar tables upon this hypothesis, and their accuracy was sufficient to enable him to predict eclipses. Delambre, one of the most critical historians of astronomy, says: "In Hipparchus we find one of the most extraordinary men of antiquity; the *very greatest*, in the sciences which require a combination of observation with geometry."† The theory of Hipparchus consists in the *resolution* of the real motions of a heavenly body into an assemblage of circular motions; as, for example, while the sun was supposed to revolve uniformly in the circumference of a small circle, the centre of this circle (epicycle) revolved uniformly in the circumference of a larger circle of which the earth occupied the centre. We may remark that this method of resolving the true motion of a body into equable circular motions, so far from being a barren hypothesis, fitted to be employed only in the early and rude age of the science, has never been superseded, but is still employed in physical astronomy, since geometers resolve all unequal motions into a series of terms which run through their periods in circles, these motions being expressed by *sines* and *cosines* of circular arcs, which increase uniformly with the time. Thus one of the most improved methods of modern physical astronomy dates far back into antiquity, having been propounded in the school of Plato more than two thousand years ago.‡

Kepler was the next great theoretical astronomer. He did away with the epicycles of Hipparchus by proving that the planets revolve around the sun in ellipses, the sun occupying one of the foci. To find the position of the planet in its orbit, he supposed it to revolve uniformly in a circle supposed to be described on the major axis, and to have a period of revolution the same as that required for the ellipse. To the position thus found a correction was applied, called the *equation of the centre.* This is known as Kepler's problem. Kepler also proved that the radius-vecter of a planet, or the imaginary line drawn from the centre of the sun to the centre of the planet, passes over equal areas in equal times, and this law enabled him to find the position of the planet in its orbit. These are known in physical astronomy as Kepler's first and second laws. The third law, that the squares of the times of revolution are proportional to the cubes of the major axis, cost him seventeen years of study. If he had divided the period of one planet by the period of another, and put the quotient equal to some unknown power of the quotient arising from dividing the distance of the former planet from the sun by the distance of the latter, he could have solved this exponential equation in an hour or two at least, even without the aid of logarithms. But the science of algebra was not then much advanced, nor was it studied then by mathematicians so extensively as at the present day, but the ancient geometry was employed in the investigations of physical problems. The application of algebra to geometry, by Descartes, has completely revolutionized the methods employed in physical research.

---

* Whewell's *Hist. of the Inductive Sciences*, Vol. II., p. 182. † *Astronomie Ancienne*, tom. i., p. 186. ‡ *Hist. Ind. Sci.*, Vol. I., p. 196.

We can, at this day, look back to the problems which so taxed the intellectual powers of Kepler, and point out easy and direct methods for solving them ; but we must not forget that these methods have been perfected only by great labor, performed by some cf the ablest minds that the world has known. Nor have these things been developed all at once by some master genius. Step by step, and extending through many years, have they been advanced. Many minds are now able, by close application to the subject, to read and understand the great truths developed in the last two centuries, but only a few were able to advance into the unknown and develop the hidden truths and principles of nature. There is a vast difference between that mind which is able to develop new truths and thus advance knowledge, and the one that is only able to follow and understand what has already been explained. Especially is this true in the mathematical and physical sciences.

Although philosophers in Kepler's day obtained some faint glimpses of the great law of gravitation, afterwards discovered by Newton, yet too many other things remained to be developed to enable him to arrive at correct and definite views on the subject of attraction. The laws of motion were scarcely understood at that period. Galileo did not discover them till the early part of the seventeenth century. In Italy, Holland and England, mathematicians viewed the problem of the celestial motions by the light which the discovery of the real laws of motion threw upon it.* Borelli, one of Galileo's pupils, entertained some correct views of the nature of central action, in a work which he published in 1666.† He referred to the whirling of a stone in a sling, to show that a circular motion gives a tendency to recede from the centre, by giving rise to centrifugal force. Huygens, afterwards, in 1673, at the end of his work, *Horologium Oscillatorium*, published some important theorems on centrifugal force, but without any demonstration. Newton afterwards gave the demonstrations in his *Principia*. While all these guesses and real discoveries served as so many aids to Newton, yet the step between them and the great discoveries of Newton was very great, and beyond any ordinary mind to accomplish.

All the discoveries to which we have now alluded pertain rather to mechanics than to astronomy; but after the nature of the planetary orbits, and the relations of the motion of one planet to another, had been made known, physical astronomy could make but little progress without the development of the science of mechanics. Newton added vastly to this department of knowledge. Even at this time, nearly two centuries after the publication of the *Principia*, the first two books of that immortal work contain almost as complete a treatise on dynamics as we have. The discovery of the law of universal gravitation by Newton, namely: that every particle of matter attracts every other particle with a force that is directly proportional to the mass, or quantity, of matter, and inversely proportional to the square of the distance, completely reduced the motions of the heavenly bodies to the science of mechanics, and now the mathematician is able to predict, ages in advance, the configuration of the planets of our system.

---

* Whewell's *Hist. Ind. Sciences*, Vol. II., p. 150.

† *Theories of the Medicean Planets*, Florence, 1666.

The *Principia* was published in the year 1687, and in that work Newton applied the law of gravitation to the determination of the motions of the moon. With a skill in the use of the ancient geometry which has never been equalled, he was able to account for the most of the irregularities then known in the motion of the moon.* He saw that the planets must be subject to similar irregularities in their motions, but the difficulties of the subject seem to have deterred him from undertaking the investigation, and this great problem he bequeathed to posterity. But the difficulty. of applying the ancient geometry entirely prevented mathematicians from making any progress beyond what Newton had done, in the great problem of planetary perturbations, for half a century after the publication of the *Principia.* Geometry has the advantage of always keeping every step, in the solution of a problem, distinctly before the mind; and when the conclusion is once reached, the successive steps carry the most complete conviction to the mind. But a more powerful instrument was needed to make further progress in the solution of the various problems which physical astronomy presented. The invention of the infinitesimal analysis by Newton and Leibnitz,† though in its infancy when Newton's work was published, afterwards supplied the necessary means for carrying on these investigations. This powerful engine of the human mind, the infinitesimal calculus, had to be perfected before it could be used in physical research. While the continental mathematicians steadily opposed the Newtonian philosophy, they were supplying the best possible means for its verification, by improving and extending the recently invented calculus. Leibnitz and the two Bernouillis, John and his son Daniel, applied themselves with great energy to this subject. The nature of this branch of mathematics seemed to peculiarly adapt it to the tracing out of complicated variable motion. "The ponderous instrument of synthesis, so effective in Newton's hands, has never since been grasped by one who could use it for such purposes, and we gaze at it with admiring curiosity, as on some gigantic implement of war, which stands idle among the memorials of ancient days, and makes us wonder what manner of man he was who could wield as a weapon what we can hardly lift as a burden." * In analysis "symbols think for us, without our dwelling constantly upon their meaning, and obtain for us the consequences which result from the relations of space and the laws of force, however complicated be the conditions under which they are combined."

---

* *Principia*, Book I, Prop. 66.

† Strictly speaking, Newton invented the fluxional calculus, and Leibnitz the differential calculus; the former conceived all quantities to be generated by motion, and the latter supposed them to be made up of indefinitely small differences: the fluential and the integral calculus are the same. The motion of the planets probably suggested the idea of the fluxional calculus.

Mathematical analysis having been brought to a sufficient state of perfection to enable mathematicians to undertake the solution of the great problem presented by the law of universal gravitation in its application to the motions of the celestial bodies, a few of the great minds of the earlier part of the last century applied themselves to the work which had thus become a necessity for the further progress of physical astronomy. The motions of the moon seemed to offer to geometers the best facilities for testing, beyond what Newton had done, the law of attraction which he had found to hold in several cases, both because of the many irregularities which its motions presented, and its use in determining terrestrial longitude, if its place in the heavens could be calculated with sufficient accuracy.

Euler seems to have been the first geometer that attempted to develop the theory of gravitation beyond what was already done in the *Principia.* In the year 1745 he investigated the perturbations of the moon's motions. At nearly the same time two of the ablest mathematicians of France, Clairault and D'Alembert, also undertook the same problems without any knowledge of each other's intentions.*

---

* Whewell.

By comparing together the observations which had been made since the re-establishment of astronomy, it was found that the motion of Jupiter was more rapid, while Saturn moved more slowly, than was indicated by comparing the same observations with those made by the ancient astronomers. These motions of the two great planets offered to the mathematician a problem worthy of his best efforts. The Academy of Sciences of Paris, accordingly, offered their prize for 1748 for an investigation of the cause of these motions. If there were but two bodies, as, for instance, the sun and the earth, it had been shown by Newton that, for this case, both bodies would describe elliptical orbits about their common centre of gravity, which point would occupy a common focus of the two ellipsis. Since the sun's mass is immensely greater than the mass of any of the planets, the motion is principally thrown upon the smaller body, that of the sun being scarcely perceptible. If we now introduce a third body and its influence into our calculation, the problem of the motion of any one of them becomes very complicated; and if the masses of the several bodies were nearly equal to one another, its solution would surpass the present powers of analysis. But in the planetary system the mass of the sun is so great as compared with the mass of any one or of all the planets, that the influence which our planet can have on the motions of another can only produce minute irregularities, which it thus becomes possible to calculate by methods of approximation which are employed. If the third body attracted the other two with the same force and in the same direction, it would not disturb their relative motions; but since that is not the case, it is the *difference* of the forces, estimated in the same direction, which act on the two bodies, that produce irregularities or perturbations. It is this difference that is called the *disturbing force.*

---

* Grant's *Hist. Phys. Ast.*, p. 44.

It is easy to find the value of the disturbing force, but when thus generally found, it is not in a condition to be employed in the actual calculation of the motions of a planet, and it becomes necessary to resolve it into a series of other forces, which decrease in value, and which can be employed. These partial forces, into which the complete value of the disturbing force is resolved, are expressed either by the sine or the cosine of an arc that increases uniformly with the time. The original series into which the disturbing force is resolved, is usually arranged according to the ascending powers of the ratio of the distances of the disturbing and of the disturbed planet from the sun, the ratio being in every case much less than unity.

In the case of the moon disturbed by the sun, the ratio to which we have referred is very small, being only about one-four-hundredth, the distance of the sun from the earth being about four hundred times as great as the distance of the moon from the earth. A very few terms of the series will suffice in the lunar theory; but in the planetary theory the ratio in question is in some cases (Venus and the earth, for instance) nearly equal to three-fourths, and a dozen or more terms have to be employed. Owing to this circumstance, the planetary theory, from the great number of terms of the completely developed series, becomes very complicated.

It was natural to conclude that the cause of the irregularities in the motions of Jupiter and Saturn was owing to their mutual attraction. Euler, Clairault, and D'Alembert attempted the solution of the problem upon this principle. Clairault first undertook to calculate the irregularities after the manner of Newton, but he met with insuperable difficulties, and finally abandoned that method for the analytical. Each of the great geometers to whom we have referred produced a memoir in which the perturbations of the motions of the planets Jupiter and Saturn were investigated by means of analytical processes. Euler's memoir was crowned by the Academy. His researches contain a valuable exposition of the theory of planetary perturbation, but he failed to throw any light on the main object of inquiry. His profound skill in analysis enabled him to surmount difficulties that would have arrested the progress of all ordinary geometers. This memoir of Euler contains the first germ of the very important method of the *variation of arbitrary constants*, a method which we must now explain.

Since the ellipse approximates the most nearly of any known curve to the orbit actually described by any one of the known planets, we may imagine an ellipse described so as to pass through any two consecutive points of the orbit. Since the disturbing force is very small when compared with the central force of the sun, which retains the planet in its orbit, the imaginary ellipse, which we have supposed drawn, cannot differ very much from the ellipse which would be described if the disturbing force did not exist. If we, therefore, suppose this ellipse to expand or contract, and to change its form, according to circumstances, so as to adapt it to the actual place of the planet, it is evident that the planet will be found at the same time in the orbit which it actually describes, and in this variable imaginary ellipse. The difficulty will now consist in calculating the magnitude, form, and position of the ellipse. This we may do by considering the elements of the planet's orbit—the major axis, the eccentricity, the longitude of the perihelion, the inclination of the plane of the orbit to a given fixed plane, and the longitude of the ascending node—for a known epoch, as variable. If it were possible to calculate the amount of the variation of each element, this correction being applied to the known elements would make known the elements of our imaginary ellipse, and it would thence be possible to calculate the actual position of the planet in its orbit. The method of the variation of arbitrary constants consists in finding analytical expressions for the variation of the known elements of a planet's orbit. The constitution of the solar system is such that, in most cases, we can estimate and apply the effects of each disturbing cause separately.

Nature actually suggests the method of variation of arbitrary constants, since, if the elements of a planet's orbit be compared with one another at different epochs considerably separated in time, they are found to have varied. We have mentioned Euler as the first that employed the method of variation of constants; but we must not omit to mention that Newton actually anticipated all others, in a measure, by representing the paths of bodies by means of *revolving orbits.*[*] Still, Euler was the first to treat the subject distinctly as the variation of arbitrary constants.[†] This he did in his memoir on the perturbations of the earth's motion, crowned by the Academy of Sciences, in the year 1756.

The perturbations of the motions of the planets are naturally divided into two general classes, *periodical* and *secular.* The periodical inequalities are dependent on the relative positions of the planets, and they pass through their periods in a comparatively short space of time, or when the planets return to their same relative positions. The secular inequalities are independent of the mutual positions of the planets, but depend on the relative situation of the *orbits* of the planets. Or, in other words, the secular inequalities result from the small uncompensated or outstanding quantities, which are left when the planets return to their same relative situations. These uncompensated quantities show themselves by affecting the elements of the orbits of the planets. This class of inequalities is by far the most important when all time is considered, since their continual accumulations in the same direction would ultimately destroy the dynamical stability of our system. It therefore becomes an interesting question to the physical astronomer to ascertain whether the secular inequalities will always continue in the same direction, or whether they are also periodical, and will only cause the elements of the planets to oscillate between fixed limits of moderate extent.

Euler sought among the secular terms for an explanation of the long inequality in the mean motions of Jupiter and Saturn, to which we have referred; but, as also stated, he was not successful. In his memoir of 1752, on Jupiter and Saturn, he found the mean motion to be affected by secular inequalities; but subsequent investigations have shown that Euler, in this case, arrived at erroneous results. In the year 1763, Lagrange, then twenty-seven years of age, gave, in the volume of the Turin Memoirs for that year, a new solution of the *problem of three bodies*, which he applied to Jupiter and Saturn. He found two secular inequalities, one addition to the mean motion of Jupiter, and the other about five times as great, and subtractive from the mean motion of Saturn. This agreed better with observation than Euler's result, which made both equations equal and addition. Lagrange did not succeed, however, in rendering a complete account of the irregularities in the mean motions of these two bodies.

---

[*] *Principia*, Bk. I., Sec. ix.

[†] Laplace says, after giving an abstract of Euler's Memoir of 1749, "C'est le premier essai de la method de la variation des constantes arbitraires." *Mec. Cel.*, livre XV., tome v., p. 305.

In the year 1773,* Laplace, then twenty-four years of age, appeared as the rival of Lagrange. He discovered that, by neglecting terms of the fourth order of small quantities, the mean motions of any two planets of our system are not affected by secular inequalities. In the year 1776 Lagrange again applied himself to the investigation of the secular inequalities, by treating the subject by the method of the variation of arbitrary constants. By a comparatively simple analysis he found that the mean distances of the planets, and consequently their mean motions (since the mean motion and time of revolution depend wholly on the mean distances, or the semi-major axes of their orbits), are not subject to any secular inequalities whatever, but are influenced only by periodical inequalities, which depend, as we have stated, on the mutual configuration of the planets, which, in general, run through their periods in comparatively short spaces of time. The importance of this result is such that it is worth while to dwell on it for a moment. Amid all the changes to which the other elements of the planetary orbits are subject—the secular changes of the eccentricities, running through hundreds of thousands of years; the secular motions of the perihelia, which in some cases cause them to perform complete revolutions in the heavens; the similar motions of the nodes, and the slow secular changes in the position of the plane of the orbits, extending through vast periods of time like the changes in the eccentricities—there are no changes in the mean distances and the mean motions, but those of a periodical character which pass through their periods in a small fraction of the time required for the secular changes. This is of the highest importance to the inhabitants of our planet, since it establishes the invariability of the solar year as regards long periods of time. This results, not from any special provision for man's benefit, but from the immutable laws of nature, of which the law of universal gravitation, discovered by Newton, is the most general.

---

* *Hist. Ind. Sciences*, Vol. II., p. 107.

The long inequality of Jupiter and Saturn being thus excluded from the secular variations of the elements of the planets, it was evident that if it were a result of the mutual attraction of the planets, it was to be sought for among the periodical inequalities. The problem had assumed this form when Laplace applied his great intellect to an examination of the subject. A little consideration on the relative magnitude and direction of the inequalities,* satisfied him that the motions under consideration were not produced by a foreign cause, but their origin must be looked for among the periodical inequalities. By comparing the mean motions of Jupiter and Saturn, he found that five times the mean motion of Saturn is very nearly equal to twice that of Jupiter. He suspected that the terms in the development of the disturbing force which had this difference for an argument (or variable part) would explain the irregularities under consideration. "The probability of this cause, and the importance of the object, determined me," says Laplace,† "to undertake the laborious calculation necessary to determine this question." When the terms were calculated, they were found to be of the order of the cubes of the eccentricities and inclinations, and similar ones exist of the fifth order with respect to the same quantities. These terms, in the differential equations, or the expressions which give the momentary variations of the quantities which are being calculated, are generally very minute, since their coëfficients are very small fractions; but when they are integrated, or when the variations which take place in any given space of time, are derived from the momentary variations, these terms acquire small divisors, which increase the numerical value of the coëfficients, and thus bring the terms into importance, and when such terms have to be integrated twice, as is the case in the question under consideration, their value is still further augmented. This investigation enabled Laplace to explain the cause of the long inequality of Jupiter and Saturn, which had given geometers so much trouble. It has a period of about 929 years.[*]

---

* *Système du Monde*, Vol. II., p. 50.

† *Sys. du Monde*, Vol. II., p. 59.

In discussing the theory of any two planets, terms of the character referred to above must be sought for, even if their coëfficients are very small in the differential equation. Thus, twice the mean motion of Mercury minus five times the mean motion of Venus is a small quantity, being only about the one-twenty fourth of the mean motion of Mercury; four times the mean motion of the earth differs from the mean motion of Mercury by only a small quantity; twice the mean motion of Mars and once the mean motion of the earth, are nearly the same; three times the mean motion of Mars is nearly the same as once the mean motion of Venus, and twice the mean motion of Neptune is nearly the same as once the mean motion of Uranus. Professor Airy also found that eight times the mean motion of Venus is nearly the same as thirteen times the mean motion of the earth, and this gives rise to an inequality which has about 240 years for its period.

Professor Newcomb, Professor Peirce, and Professor Kirkwood have discovered some equations which exist among the mean motions of the planets Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus and Neptune.[†] Professor Newcomb found that three times the mean motion of Uranus, plus eight times the mean motion of Neptune, equal the mean motion of Jupiter. Professor Kirkwood found that three times the mean motion of Saturn, plus eleven times the mean motion of Neptune, equal twice the mean motion of Jupiter. Several other equations were pointed out. Though these relations will possess but little interest for the general reader, they are very interesting to the physical astronomer, since they will give rise to very important, though in general small terms, when the mutual effects of these planets are simultaneously considered.

---

[*] See *Memoir Acad. Sciences* for 1784.

[†] Gould's *Ast. Jour.*, Vol. V., p. 101; *Silliman's Journal*, Jan. 1872, p. 67, and March, 1872, p. 208.

In 1782, Lagrange investigated the perturbations of the planets by a method which embraced both the secular and the periodical inequalities in a common analysis. This he did by considering all the perturbations in the motions of the planets as due to the variation of the elements of their orbits. Having found the differential or momentary variations of the elements, he separated them into two classes, one dependent on the mutual configuration of the bodies, which gave the periodical variations, and the other dependent on the mutual positions of the orbits, which gave the secular variations.* The results which he obtained coincided with the results which he and Laplace had already found by other methods.

All the general results to which we have now referred were obtained by taking into consideration only the *first* power of the disturbing forces. That is, when the effect of the variation of the elements, on the *succeeding* variation, is *not* taken into consideration, the result is said to be a first approximation, or of the order of the first power of the disturbing force; but when this variation *is* taken into consideration, it is said to be a second approximation, and the result is of the order of the *square* of the disturbing force. In the year 1808 M. Poisson, then only twenty-five years of age, attacked the problem of perturbations in this form. His result was, that to the second order of approximation the mean distances are subject to only periodical variations.

This result to which M. Poisson was conducted had the effect to again direct the great masters, Lagrange and Laplace, to the subject of planetary perturbations. The former was then an old man seventy-two years of age, but his mind was yet vigorous, and his great powers of generalization conducted him, as De Morgan says,* to "the most general theorem which has yet been attained in the mathematics of mechanics, not excepting the principle of virtual velocities, or that of D'Alembert." By transferring the origin of coördinates to the centre of gravity of the system of bodies under consideration, his analysis became general, and he showed that even when the variation of the elements of the *disturbing* planet was taken into consideration, the mean distances were not subject to secular variations. Thus it was demonstrated that to the second power of the disturbing force the mean distances and mean motions are subject only to periodical perturbations.

---

* *Mem. Acad.* Berlin, 1781, 82, 83.

Soon after this Lagrange communicated a memoir to the Institute, in which he exhibited the application of the theory of the variations of arbitrary constants to all questions of mechanical science. This he did, by finding the variation of the six arbitrary constants, introduced by the integration of three differential equations of the second order (to which he had shown, in his *Mécanique Analytique*, that the motion of every system of bodies may be reduced), caused by a small disturbing force, in terms of the partial differential coëfficients of a quantity termed the *disturbing function*, with respect to the constants themselves, which enter implicitly into this function. Lagrange stated that this method might be applied to the determination of the motion of rotation of bodies about their centres of gravity, when the motion was disturbed by the attraction of a foreign body. This part of the theory was soon after supplied by Poisson in a memoir in which he investigated the expressions for the variation of the arbitrary constants, by a more direct analysis than that given by Lagrange.†

In the present state of analysis, as applied to celestial mechanics, the principal difficulty in computing the perturbations of the planetary motions consists in developing the disturbing function into a converging series, in functions of the mean motions of the planets, and of the elements of their orbits. Several methods have been proposed for doing this, all of which involve an immense amount of labor when the development is carried to a high order of approximation. The analytical formulæ are so long and complicated, that there is great danger that errors will creep into them; and then the numerical application to all the planets becomes so tedious (and here, too, there is great danger of error), that but few have undertaken the labor necessary to carry the development to the higher powers of the eccentricities and inclinations. Among those who have performed this labor, we may mention M. Burchardt,[*] who carried the numerical calculations up to the sixth powers of the eccentricities. M. Binet carried the approximations up to the seventh powers of the eccentricities and inclinations, in a memoir presented to the Academy of Sciences in 1812. M. Pontécoulant subsequently repeated these calculations, and carried the approximations up to the sixth order with respect to the eccentricities and inclinations.[†] M. Leverrier has also carried the development of disturbing functions up to the seventh order of small quantities.[‡]

---

* *Calculus*, p. 532. † *Journal de l'Ecole Polytechnique*, Vol. VIII., p. 266 *et seq.*

Other methods have been employed for developing the disturbing function. The method of mechanical quadratures has been employed by several geometers. M. Poisson has published[§] two papers on the subject; and M. Pontécoulant has treated the subject in his *Theorie Analytique du Système du Monde.*[‖] M. Hansen has also determined the coëfficients of the disturbing function by this method. Another method is to give particular values to the disturbing function, and then, by means of the equations formed between them and the corresponding series, eliminate as many coëfficients as is desirable, and thus determine their value. M. Leverrier has practised this method with complete success in computing the perturbations of Uranus by Saturn.[¶]

---

[*] *Memoires de l'Institute*, 1808. [†] *Système du Monde*, tome iii., livre vi. [‡] *Annales de l'Observatoire Imperiale*, tome i. [§] *Connaissance des Temps* for the years 1835 and 1836. [‖] Tome iii., livre vi., chap. ii. [¶] *Con. des Temps* for 1849.

There is still another method which has never yet been employed, so far as we know, though it seems to offer decided advantages. It consists in finding the general term in the development of this important function by means of *Laplace's Equation*, technically so called. Having obtained the expansion of the general term to the order required, all the other terms would, of course, follow immediately from it.* The numerical calculations can be performed by any ordinary computer, since the formula are all of an ordinary algebraic character.

Since the dynamical stability of the planetary system is dependent on the character of the secular inequalities, it is necessary to give a brief account of the labors of several distinguished geometers who have devoted their attention to this class of perturbations. Lagrange and Laplace were the master minds in this department of physical astronomy. The integration of the differential equations to which they arrived was extremely difficult, and, for a time, it arrested the progress of both geometers. The genius of Lagrange—whose command of analysis was perhaps never equalled by any other mathematician—was equal to the task, however, for he succeeded in transforming the variables so as to reduce the differential equations to the linear form. The perihelia and eccentricities are usually treated together, and also the nodes and inclinations. Laplace applied, successfully, Lagrange's method of integration to his own expressions for the nodes and inclinations; and he also extended it to the perihelia and eccentricities. Laplace finally succeeded in demonstrating the following elegant and important theorems: "If the mass of each planet be multiplied by the square of the eccentricity, and this product by the square root of the mean distance, the sum of these quantities will always retain the same magnitude." This sum is found to be small for any given epoch, and hence it must always remain small. "If the mass of each planet be multiplied by the square of the tangent of the orbit's inclination to a fixed plane, and this product by the square root of the mean distance, the sum of such quantities will continue invariable." This sum is found to be small for any given epoch.*

---

*A memoir is now preparing on this method of development, in which the terms are carried to the eighth order of small quantities, and it will probably soon be ready for publication.

The ultimate condition of the eccentricities and the inclinations depends in each case on the resolution of an algebraic equation of a degree equal to the number of planets under consideration, and involving their masses in indeterminate forms. Lagrange showed that all the roots of the equation must be real and unequal, in order that the corresponding eccentricity or inclination should oscillate between fixed limits. By giving the masses particular values (such as were then known), Lagrange showed that the above condition was fulfilled. Laplace demonstrated that the roots are real and unequal, without employing particular values for the masses.

Lagrange was the first to deduce the numerical values of the limits of the eccentricities and inclinations. To accomplish this it is necessary to resolve an algebraic equation of a degree equal to the number of planets considered. To simplify this work he divided the planets into two groups, Saturn and Jupiter (to which he subsequently added Uranus), constituting one, and Mercury, Venus, the Earth, and Mars, constituting the other. After more accurate values of the masses of the planets and the elements of their orbits became known, a desire was felt for a new determination of the inferior and superior limits of the eccentricities and inclinations. Pontécoulant undertook to supply the necessary calculation, and he published his researches in his *Système du Monde*;† but the numerical value of the constants which he obtained are erroneous, owing to his employing a sufficient number of decimals in his computations. This labor did not, therefore, extend our knowledge of this important subject. In 1839 M. Leverrier calculated anew the secular variations of the planetary elements, and his results have since been used for correcting most of the planetary elements and masses. Leverrier employed in his investigations the whole seven principal planets then known.

---

* *Mém. Acad. des Sciences*, 1784. † Tome iii., livre vi., chap. xi. 1834.

A very important contribution to this department of physical astronomy is that recently published by Mr. John N. Stockwell, in the "Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge." In this memoir Mr. Stockwell has considered the simultaneous action of the eight principal planets, Mercury, Venus, the Earth, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune, which necessitated the reduction of an equation of the 8th degree. "The equation of the eighth degree, when completely developed, is composed of eighty thousand six hundred and forty distinct monomial terms, each of which contains eight factors. The actual formation of this equation (by elimination) could therefore with difficulty be brought within the compass of an ordinary lifetime; and we must, therefore, seek for a shorter and more expeditious method of attaining results which seem to necessarily involve such an immense expenditure of labor."* Mr. Stockwell has, accordingly, devised a most elegant method of approximation by means of which he was enabled to obtain accurate results.

We shall now briefly state the important conclusions at which he has arrived. For Mercury's orbit, the limits of the eccentricity are 0.1214943 and 0.2317185. The perihelion completes a revolution in the heavens in 237,197 years. The limits of the inclination of its orbit to the fixed ecliptic of 1850, are 10° 36′ 20″ and 3° 47′ 8″. For Venus the limits of the eccentricity are 0 and 0.0706329. Since the theoretical eccentricity of the orbit of Venus is a vanishing element, the perihelion of her orbit can have no mean motion. The inclination of her orbit to the ecliptic of 1850 varies between the limits 0° 0′ 0″ and 4° 51′ 0″.

The elements pertaining to the motions of the earth being of greater interest to us than those pertaining to any of the planets, he has given us more details for this case. The eccentricity varies between the limits 0 and 0.0693888. The mean motion of the perihelion is indeterminate. The inclination of the apparent ecliptic to the fixed ecliptic of 1850 is always less than 4° 41′. The mean value of the precession of the equinoxes in a Julian year (365.25 days) is equal to 50″.438239, where the equinoxes will perform a complete revolution in 25,694 years. Owing to the secular inequalities of their motion, this time may vary from the actual time by 281 years. The tropical year, owing to the variation of the rate of precession, may be larger than at present by 49.27 seconds; and it may be shorter by 59.13 seconds. The tropical year is now shorter than in the time of Hipparchus by 11.3 seconds.

---

* *Memoir*, p. 12.

The mean value of the obliquity of both the apparent and the fixed ecliptic to the equator is 23° 17′ 17″. The limits of the apparent ecliptic to the equator are 24° 35′ 58″ and 21° 58′ 36″. These limits are in part dependent on the spheroidal figure of the earth.

The duration of the seasons is greatly modified by the eccentricity of the earth's orbit. At present the difference between summer and winter is about 7.75 days; but when the eccentricity is a maximum, or nearly that, and the transverse axis passes through the solstices, both of which conditions have been fulfilled in past ages, the summer in our hemisphere will be about 198.75 days in length, and the winter will have a length of only 166.5 days, giving a difference of 32.25 days, or more than a month. The distance of the earth from the sun will vary in the course of a year by 18,000,000 miles, or by nearly a seventh part.

The limits of the elements of the other planets are as follows:

Mars,	max. eccentricity,	0.1396550,	min.	0.018475
Jupiter,	“ “	0.0608274,	“	0.0254928
Saturn,	“ “	0.0843289,	“	0.0123719
Uranus,	“ “	0.0779652,	“	0.0117576
Neptune,	“ “	0.0145066,	“	0.0055729

Mars,	max. inclination,	7° 28′ 0″	“	0° 0′ 0″
Jupiter,	“ “	0 23 56	“	0 14 23
Saturn,	“ “	1 0 39	“	0 47 16
Uranus,	“ “	1 2 10	“	0 54 25
Neptune,	“ “	0 47 21	“	0 33 43

The mean motion of the perihelia of the orbits of Jupiter and Uranus is just the same for each, 3″.716607. The motion of the nodes of Jupiter's and Saturn's orbit, on the invariable plane of the solar system, is the same, being 25″.934567, in a retrograde direction. These relations Mr. Stockwell embodies in two general propositions, as follows: "I. The mean motion of Jupiter's perihelion is exactly equal to the mean motion of the perihelion of Uranus, and the mean longitudes of these perihelia differ by exactly 180°. II. The mean motion of Jupiter's node on the invariable plane is exactly equal to that of Saturn, and the mean longitude of these nodes differ by exactly 180°."*

His investigations bring to light a curious relation between the mass of Venus and the maximum value of her eccentricity. If the mass be gradually increased, the maximum value of the eccentricity would be increased, until the mass reaches a certain limit, when the maximum value of the eccentricity will diminish with a further increase of the mass. A similar relation seems to hold in the case of the earth. Whether this be an accidental relation or not, is uncertain. It has the appearance of a real physical significance.

ART. V.—1. *The University of Pennsylvania. Public Inauguration of the New Building erected for the Department of Art and the Department of Science.* Newspaper Report. Philadelphia, 1872.

2. *University of Pennsylvania. Special Announcement of the Organization and Courses of Study of the New Department of Science.* To be opened September, 1872. Pamphlet. Philadelphia, 1872.

THERE are a great many well-meaning people—probably the majority—who think that critics are in their glory only when passing censure. Were this true, it would follow that they are at best an ill-natured race. But it is not so. Even those known as satirists—those who have inflicted most pain—prove on acquaintance as capable of all the tenderer emotions of our nature as any other class of writers. The severest critics among the Greeks were Socrates, Aristotle, Lucian, and Longinus; the severest among the Romans, Juvenal, Horace, and Quintilian. Which of either nationality can be said to have been wanting in good-nature or in human sympathy? The one who of all the Romans was most distinctively a critic in the modern sense of the term, and who accordingly was most disliked both by bad authors and bad educators, was Quintilian. But what is the estimate we have of him from authors and educators of the highest rank? As it is the best authors and best educators who are the best friends of critics at the present day—as it is they who value their labors and esteem themselves, while they are much more likely to be abused by the worthless tribe of authors and educators—so it was in the time of Quintilian. Thus in all classic literature there is not a nobler tribute to any author than that paid by Horace to one of the class who have ever been objects of detestation to the whole "dark lantern" genus. "Are, then, the eyes of Quintilian sealed in endless sleep?" exclaims one of the most charming of poets. "When will Modesty and unspotted Faith, the sister of Justice and unadorned Truth, ever find an equal to him? He is gone, bewailed by many good men, *by none more than by thee*, O Virgil!"

---

* Memoir, p. xiv.

Ergo Quintilium perpetuus sopor
Urget! cui Pudor, et Justitiæ soror,
Incorrupta Fides, nudaque Veritas,
Quando illum invenient parem?
Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit;
Nulli flebilior quam tibi, Virgili.*

True, two at least of the Greeks, Socrates and Longinus, suffered death for their criticisms, and it is more than suspected that Lucian met a similar fate. But we need only speak now of Socrates and Longinus. Who had a warmer sympathy for his race than the former? Who was a more faithful or more affectionate friend than the secretary of Queen Zenobia, put to death by her victorious but ungallant enemy, for his fidelity to her cause—the cause of justice, the cause of the weak against the strong? The severest critics of modern times—those of England, France, and Germany—are too familiar to our readers to render it necessary to say anything more of them here than to ask, Which of them was more ill-natured than writers in general? Was the author of "Hudibras?" Was "Junius," whether we regard him as Sheridan, Burke, or Francis? Was Jeffreys? Was St. Beuve? Was Schlegel? Was Herder? Was Maginn? etc., etc.

---

* *Od.* i. 24, 1.

No. There is not one of all whom it would not be as unreasonable to accuse of ill-nature on account of his criticisms as it would be to accuse the surgeon of ill-nature on account of his surgical operations. It is not denied that the lancet causes pain and suffering; but it is as generally admitted by intelligent men that it prevents much more pain and suffering than it inflicts. Is the same true, or is it not, of the critic's pen? At all events, it is because we think it is that we take the liberty, from time to time, of criticising all whom we think may be improved by criticism, and all on whom criticism may exercise a salutary influence on others, if they are so blind or obdurate themselves that nothing will arouse them to a proper sense of their duties.

It is true that we hesitate less to criticise a public institution than we do to criticise an individual, even though the latter be a public functionary. And still greater is the difference if the former claims to be an institution of learning. We make this distinction for two reasons; the first is, that in our opinion, on no institutions does the public weal depend more, especially in republics, than on colleges and universities; the second, that there are no institutions the nature of whose work, as faithfully and efficiently performed, we have studied so long or so much.

Yet when the facts are known it cannot be said that we have been in any hurry to criticise the University of Pennsylvania; on the contrary, we have long abstained from doing so. For this also we had a twofold motive. There are hosts of Philadelphians, to offend whom would give us much pain; and no other city can boast a more impartial or more faithful press of its own than the Quaker City. It would ill become us to overlook the fact that among its editors are men distinguished alike for their ability and their integrity, and who are appreciated and honored accordingly by their fellow-citizens. Were we disposed to pay compliments which are not needed, we could mention several of those gentlemen who are abundantly qualified by learning and literary talent to make every necessary criticism on the University of Pennsylvania. To this we trust we need hardly add that it is in no arrogant spirit we take up the subject. The truth is, that we have been urged to do so by some of the ablest editors as well as some of the most intelligent private citizens, and public functionaries, of Philadelphia; the reason for urging us, while the work could be so well done at home, being, that an article in a Quarterly which is known pays so much attention to higher education might have more effect than articles in the newpapers.

What first led us to question the efficiency of the University of Pennsylvania, was a casual intercourse we had two or three years since with several of its recent graduates. We had no reason to doubt the honesty or truthfulness of the young gentlemen alluded to, and yet we confess we became quite skeptical when they informed us that they had graduated with high honors at the University of Pennsylvania. Surely, thought we, the University teaches its students, at least, not only to spell, but also to write the vernacular tongue more or less correctly, although "the dead languages" evidently remain dead, indeed, in its hands.

Our misgivings led us to inquire and investigate, but the more we did so the more the most serious of those misgivings were increased, until we became convinced that in its present condition the institution had no just claim to the character of an efficient high school much less to that of a university. But it is proper to add that in all our researches we found testimony tending to show that the medical department should be regarded as an exception to the general condition of torpidity, indolence, inefficiency—nay, it must be said, ignorance—prevailing at that institution.

In order that there should be no mistake on our part, however, and that we should do no injustice to the institution, we addressed a note to Charles J. Stillé, LL. D., as president of the university, respectfully inquiring whether it would be agreeable to him to allow us the privilege of hearing some of the recitations in Latin, Greek, or English literature. Without implying any doubt that the University was all it claimed to be, we remarked that we wished to give our impressions of it, such as they might be, in our journal. To this we added that we would not interfere in any manner with the recitations ; that we would not presume to propose any questions to the students, and that our apology for asking the privilege was the interest which we always take, however humbly, in the great cause of education. Dr. Stillé replied in polite language, but the greater part of his letter was occupied in explaining to us that "there is no such person as the President of the University of Pennsylvania," that he is the Provost, etc. Evading our respectful inquiry, he concluded by informing us that we could be present at the commencement exercises in June, when the public were admitted. We confess that the meaning of this in our mind was: "Both students and instructors would make a sorry figure at their ordinary work, but when the cramming process has been duly performed, and the reporters of the daily papers are present to render ample justice to all the wonderful results of that process, then the circumstances are different. At all events, it is not likely that you will leave your desk in New York toward the close of June, come on to Philadelphia and watch for two days, at an exhibition like ours, to see how we teach the young idea how to shoot;" and Dr. Stillé was quite right in coming to this conclusion. If we only wanted "exhibitions," we had plenty of such much nearer home.

Still we continue to receive letters from educated men, not only from Philadelphia, but also from several of the neighboring towns and villages, all of which agree in at least one point:

however much they differ in other respects, they are unanimous in the opinion that the University of Pennsylvania, if not exactly a fraud, makes a near approach to that character. Presently we will extract some passages from those letters, but before doing so we have another word or two to say. After an interval of about a year we again address Dr. Stillé. As the new buildings had now been constructed, we were led to suppose that improved rules would prevail; we thought it reasonable to expect that at least the rule of secrecy and mystery would be abolished. This time we intimate to the provost, in as courteous language as we can use, that if we are not allowed to judge for ourselves in regard to the system of instruction pursued at the University, we must only inform ourselves in the best way we can, in order to comply, as far as possible, with the wishes of that portion of our readers who feel that they have a right to know what the institution is really able and willing to do.

Again we receive a polite note from Dr. Stillé. He informs us that he would be pleased to show us all the class-rooms, the lecture-halls, etc. In short, he would show every courtesy, except to allow the recitations to be heard by one who might possibly make unfavorable criticisms upon them. Indeed, so far as promptness in replying is concerned, we know no better correspondent. He has, however, failed once in this sort of courtesy. Before we became fully aware that the University of Pennsylvania differs in some important particulars from other universities, we took the liberty of writing to him in Latin, using none of the vernacular. Whether it was that our Latinity was not up to his standard, and that he was therefore disgusted with it, or whether he regarded our epistle as a satire in disguise on the University of Pennsylvania, we have never to this day received any reply to our Latin communication. This has seemed to us all the more strange from the fact that as soon as we wrote in English, on taking it for granted that it was useless, or worse than useless, to write in "an unknown tongue," the gentleman wrote at once as shown above. That we were not the less civil, however, for using the Roman dialect, will be seen by the initiated from the opening paragraph of that fruitless missive:

"Kal. xii, Nov. 1871.

"Ad Dr. Carolum J. Stillé, *Præfectum*, *etc.*:

"Care Domine.—Quando eram in urbe amœna tua, nuper, visitabat tuum auditorium. Volebam per multum te videre, sed infeliciter foris eras. Verum est, certé, quod Prof. Johannes McElroy valdé comis et jucundus erat. Equidem, si placet tibi, vellem multas gratias illi, per te, agere pro urbanitati suæ."

When it is borne in mind that in the same epistle we used such other complimentary expressions as "*doctæ et inclytæ Universitatis tuæ*," it can hardly be said that the learned provost had any good reason to take offence. And if he was not offended—if the University of Pennsylvania was not offended—why did he not at least acknowledge the receipt of that communication? But to return to the "injunction of secrecy."

It is but justice to Dr. Stillé to say that we have learned in the course of our researches that the experience of the University of Pennsylvania, in regard to the admission of strangers of an inquiring turn to the class-rooms, is by no means favorable. It seems that in former times that institution was as liberal in that respect as any other having pretensions equally lofty. But once a German traveller was permitted to see all the mysteries. Aware that the faculty were at best rather shy of savants, this gentleman disclaimed all knowledge of "the dead languages," and other abstruse branches of study, beyond the merest smattering. To this he added, we are told, that he had two young nephews to educate—lads whose primary education had been neglected—that he was assured that the University of Pennsylvania would be an excellent place for them; and that although he could not pretend to be a judge in such matters, yet it would gratify him very much to see what progress other lads had made in that institution. We are not sure that Dr. Stillé was the provost then, but whoever that learned functionary was, he at once admitted our German friend.

But what does the latter do after he has seen all? He has the ill-nature, the ingratitude, probably the "malice aforethought," etc., to inform all who ask his opinion, that the University of Pennsylvania is really of no higher grade, as an educational institution, than a second or third rate grammar school! This was bad enough in itself, but it was made a hundred-fold more so by certain indiscreet editors, who not only told the whole story in their papers, but affected to believe that the German traveller was correct in his estimate! We are assured that up to this time there was no secrecy in regard to the recitations. Perhaps we should not wonder then that a resolution was passed about this time, that all strangers suspected of being of an investigating or fault-finding turn should be strictly prohibited from being present at any recitations in the University of Pennsylvania! It seems, however, that soon afterwards a clause was added, the substance of which is the following: "Resolved, that nothing in the foregoing Rule be construed as excluding reporters of the daily papers employed at proper intervals to praise the faculty, individually or collectively, as the case may be, and to impress on the public, at the same time, and in the same way, the wonderful progress the students are making in all the departments of human knowledge."

We may remark, in passing, that these "rules and regulations" will remind many of our readers of such Catholic institutions as Seton Hall, N. J., and Fordham, N. Y. But if they remind them of any of the better class of either Catholic or Protestant colleges, it is only by contrast. Need we inform our readers that it is only inferior colleges and universities of any sect—those really such only in name—that attempt to surround their classes with any secrecy or mystery? Who needs to be reminded that the institutions of the opposite character, far from making objections, or throwing obstacles in the way when a wish is expressed by any intelligent person to observe the working of their systems, cheerfully afford every possible facility for such observation? Nay, whether the heads of the latter class are Protestants or Catholics, whether they be called Rev. Doctors or Rev. Fathers, or merely Brothers; or whether they call themselves president, provost, director, or rector—they are much more likely to invite those who profess to take an interest in education to see their classes, and to urge that they examine them, than to evince the slightest unwillingness in that respect. We can say, without fear of contradiction, that this has been our invariable experience, both in Europe and America. But in the present instance we need not go beyond the United States for illustrative examples.

Thus, if we inquire which are confessedly the best educational institutions in America, we shall find that the same are the most willing to admit visitors to their class-rooms. We hold that there is not a single exception in the whole United States to this rule. Thus, take Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and the University of the city of New York. There is not one of these whose president, or chancellor, has not most cheerfully afforded us every possible facility to form an opinion of its system of teaching. The warmest admirers of Dr. Stillé can hardly claim that he is so able and accomplished an educator as President Barnard, President Woolsey, or President Eliot, each of whom has done us the honor of introducing us in person to his class-rooms, and giving directions that we be allowed to hear any recitations we wished. As for the venerable Chancellor Ferris, he has invited us to the same privilege many a time,

Nor have those colleges, universally recognized as the best of our Catholic institutions, evinced any different feeling. Georgetown, Holy Cross, and Manhattan, have manifested as much willingness in this respect as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, etc. Even Dr. Ferris has not urged us more strongly to visit his class-rooms, and to examine his classes, than the Jesuits, Father Clark and Father Early; and still more emphatically may we say so of such other "monks" as Brother Patrick and Brother Paulian.

But we know no exception to the rule, that those who perform good, faithful work, are not afraid to have their work seen, or even examined; neither do we know any exception to the opposite rule, that all inferior colleges and universities are very decidedly unwilling to admit any strangers to hear the recitations of their classes, except they be illiterate strangers, or strangers whom they have good reason to believe belong to the admiring class. What is, perhaps, still more remarkable, and equally undeniable, is the fact that this unwillingness is evinced more or less rudely in proportion as the degree of inferiority is low.

It is true, that, considered in this light, the University of Pennsylvania is comparatively respectable. Thus, so far as we know, there are only *two* other colleges in the United States who refuse to allow their recitations to be heard by any intelligent person, not known to belong to the "appreciative" class. These two are Fordham and Seton Hall. The standard of education at Fordham is about the same as that of the University of Pennsylvania, except that, perhaps, billiard playing does not receive so much prominence as a branch of education at the latter institution, if it be taught there at all, as it does at the former. Be this as it may, either is many degrees above Seton Hall; or, in other words, either has many degrees to sink before it reaches the "lower depth" of that institution. Accordingly, Dr. Stillé evinces no unseemly feeling further than to refuse; his refusal is couched in gentlemanly language. Father Shea does not, perhaps, manifest his unwillingness in a manner quite so polite as Dr. Stillé, but he says nothing discourteous. Upon the other hand, the Very Rev. Father Corrigan is not merely discourteous under similar circumstances, but abusive. An apple-woman, whose "cart" is upset by accident or design, so that her wares are in danger of being picked up and devoured by the passing urchins, could hardly manifest more rage, or make use of lower or more debasing expressions than the Very Rev. President and Professor of Christian Ethics at Seton Hall, although, as long as he thinks that all that is required is to show the billiard saloon, the drinking saloon, or the dormitories, he is as mild as a lamb, and as cheerful and loquacious as a purple-head parrot, who has just dined on almonds and red pepper. Thus, then, the order of rank is, Dr. Stillé, Father Shea, *Very* Rev. Father Corrigan; in other words, University of Pennsylvania, St. John's College, Fordham, Seton Hall College, New Jersey.

We shall now see whether there are any other circumstances which seem to prove that the rank we assign to the University of Pennsylvania and its very discreet, if not very learned Provost, is in accordance with their merits. But let us first transcribe one or two of the letters alluded to above, omitting only the names of the writers:

PHILADELPHIA, April 10, 1872.

"DR. E. I. SEARS:

"DEAR SIR—There are hundreds here who think you rather slight your Pennsylvania friends, especially those of Philadelphia. I have read at least a dozen of your articles on colleges, and in almost every instance have been delighted with your criticisms. I confess that in no instance have I concluded the perusal of one of those discussions, without feeling convinced that your strictures were eminently just. I have been all the more anxious on this account, in common with many other friends of higher education, that you would turn your earnest attention to some of our Pennsylvania colleges, especially to the University, which Philadelphia pampers so much, but which, like most other pampered things, is only made worse and worse the more it is pampered.

"Allow me to say, in all kindness, that you are all the more to blame for not exhibiting this pompous affair in its true character, from the fact that some allusions you have made to it from time to time show that you are by no means ignorant of its radical and glaring defects. Mere allusions do little if any good in a case like this. If you want to serve us, you will take up your probe and scalpel and perform complete operations. If I can aid you in obtaining information, you are welcome to call upon me at any time.

"Faithfully yours,

"——— ———."

Another gentleman, who is also entirely competent to judge for himself, writes as follows:

"PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 18, 1871.

"EDW. I. SEARS, LL.D.

"DEAR SIR:—Although I have not the pleasure of your personal acquaintance, I have been familiar with the National Quarterly for ten years past. May I take the liberty, on the latter ground, to suggest that you would render Philadelphia an incalculable service by overhauling the University of Pennsylvania, as you have certain other institutions, male and female, to which it bears a remarkable similarity?

"You need not fear that any of our leading journalists will regard you as an intruder on their domain. I can assure you that the ablest and best of them, without a single exception, would be very glad that a stranger would administer that excoriation which they know is so well deserved, and so necessary, but which their personal relations with some of the parties most directly concerned preclude them from administering themselves.

"But, first of all, you should try to secure admission to the classes by hook or crook. In any other institution claiming to occupy any respectable rank, there would be no difficulty in this respect. Here, however, there is every difficulty. Before you are permitted to see the mysteries, you must be duly initiated. If there is the least suspicion that you are critically disposed, and not blinded by ignorance, you must not hope to hear any recitations at the University of Pennsylvania. At all events do not fail to make the effort. You remember the line in Terence:

Nihil tam difficile est quid quærendo investigari possiet.

"Then at worst the fact of continuing the 'injunction of secrecy' will tell for itself.

"Hoping for the best, I remain,

"Your obedient servant,

"———— ————."

In order to guard against the possibility of our being influenced by personal pique on the part of those who have written to us thus, without having received any intimation from us, further than what they may have inferred from our published criticisms, we made inquiries of the most distinguished scholars and literary men of Philadelphia. To these inquiries we have received a pile of replies, all, with scarcely an exception, fully corroborating the views of those who took the initiative in writing to us on the subject as above. Of the replies recently received it will be sufficient to present our readers one which may be regarded as eminently representative, and the candor and impartiality of which will be apparent to all.

"PHILADELPHIA, Friday, Nov. 22, 1872.

"MY DEAR DOCTOR—As you will see by the enclosed slips which I have just found after the forenoon's search among put-by newspapers, the University is now to be transferred to splendid new buildings in West Philadelphia. The speeches delivered on Oct. 11, on the inauguration thereof, will tell you how the money was raised, and generally tell you the history of the University. I send a slip rather than a newspaper, for newspapers often don't reach their intended destination.

"Since you ask my opinion I tell you in confidence that I arrived long ago at the conclusion that this University, with one exception, is 'a cheat, a mockery, and a delusion.' The exception is its medical department, the only live branch of the tree, which flourishes because, having to compete with the Jefferson Medical College—an excellent institution—it had to be alive, or sink. It is about as good as the other, and both have made Philadelphia the foremost school of medicine in America. Most of the professors, you will see, are connected with this medical and surgical department. Professor Allen, in the Greek chair, is an erudite and modest man, and J. P. Lesley, Professor of Mining, is a good teacher.

"I honestly believe that few graduates of this University know languages or science. Among *the most ignorant men I have met here* are persons who had graduated in the University of Pennsylvania, men who know 'little Latin and less Greek,' and cannot speak five minutes without breaking Priscian's head; men who may write decent business letters, *but spell as pleases their own fancy*. How they could have graduated *has been the puzzle of many years to me*.

"Take away the medical department of this University, and little more remains—in languages, law, science, and arts—than the shadow of a shade. I will not say it is a 'bogus,' but that it is an effete institution; and I *have yet to meet one good scholar educated at it.* Yet folks here think it a fine affair!

"Very faithfully,

"————————."

There is nothing overlooked in this letter which could be justly said in favor of the institution. But how little that is! In the main, its testimony is exactly like that given by every intelligent, honest man, who has any knowledge of that institution, and takes any interest in the intellectual wants, tastes, and aspirations of Philadelphia.*

***Fortunately, Philadelphia has by no means to depend exclusively on the University of Pennsylvania in these respects. She has several institutions in which both the classic languages and the sciences are taught intelligently and efficiently. This is eminently true, for example, of La Salle College, although it eschews display and clap-trap; but accordingly there is no in-**

But let us see what is the testimony of the University itself. Regarding what we have hitherto been considering as external evidence, we will now turn our attention, though only for a moment, to what may be regarded as the internal evidence. We have a large mass of this in the five columns of closely printed matter, cut from the Philadelphia Ledger, of October 12, 1872, and for a copy of which we are indebted to the courtesy of the author of the letter last quoted above.

Curiously enough, the burden of all this speeching is the *windows* of the University's new buildings! Every orator has a "memorial window" for his text. Far be it from us to deny that an institution of learning should honor the memory of those who have distinguished themselves by their efforts to increase its efficiency, and secure for it an honorable name. Still less would we deny that some of the highest and greatest names that adorn our history, have such claims on the University of Pennsylvania. In illustration of this, we need only mention Benjamin Franklin and David Rittenhouse, although neither the philosopher nor the astronomer received the smallest part of his education at the University of Pennsylvania, or was in any manner indebted to that institution for his learning or his fame. There is scarcely one of the others to whom "memorial windows" are consecrated, who had either learning or fame of more than ordinary character, of whom the same may not be said. But had it been otherwise—had all these illustrious men been *alumni* of the University—even then the windows would not have been the proper place for the perpetuation of their memory. This, however, we shall not quarrel with. We have no particular objection to see things burnished on the outside, if the inside be in keeping with that burnishing. But this is notoriously not the case in the University of Pennsylvania, and accordingly we must confess that its "memorial windows" remind us too forcibly

---

stitution in America whose classes are more accessible to all who wish to observe their progress, or put their training to the test. There, instead of being evaded by excuses more or less polite, but puerile, as at the University of Pennsylvania and Fordham, or by downright abuse, as at Seton Hall, they are treated as invited, welcome guests.

of the "memorial windows" of institutions like Barnum's Museum—windows that lead the credulous to expect to be shown for their money many wonderful things, whereas, when they have paid their money, most of those things, if not all, prove to have no existence, at least in that particular museum!

It now only remains for us to extract a passage or two from some of the orators who took the most prominent part in the inauguration ceremonies. We should like to present our readers several long extracts as curiosities, but we have so little space and time left now that we must necessarily be brief. It will be admitted that from none connected with the institution should we expect more important information, or better things, than from the head of its Faculty. But let us see:—

> "Professor C. J. Stillé, M. D., LL. D., Provost of the Faculty, replied, and, after a few introductory remarks, said: 'To-day we come before the world with the formal announcement that we have *here at last a true* University, complete in all its parts, in which men may receive in all the various departments of human knowledge that training and liberal culture which shall fit them to be *the leaders and guides of their fellow-men.* Such an event is not only memorable in the history of the University, but it is also one, *if rightly apprehended,* of great significance in the history of the community in which we live. For *if it be true* that we have *here* and *now* a University *able* and *ready* to do the work which such an institution should do, and the people of Philadelphia are *fully impressed with that belief,* then, *indeed,* it *is not easy* to exaggerate the importance of the event, or overestimate the far-reaching results of what has been done to us and to those who are to come after us.'"

We italicize a few words, although it is scarcely necessary. Let the reader please admire the grammar of this passage, especially that of the second and third sentences. First, it is admitted that it is only "at last" we have got "a *true* University" in Philadelphia. Of course, it follows that the thing hitherto called by that name was but a sham. In some instances more truth is told by implication than by direct statement, and the present is clearly one of those instances. Now that Philadelphia has "at last" secured the "true" thing, her good people may expect hereafter to "be the leaders and guides of their fellow-men"(!) We entirely agree with the learned Provost that this is "of great significance," "if rightly apprehended," to "the community in which we (the Faculty, etc.,) live." Still a doubt creeps in, "For *if it be true* that we have *here and now* a University *able* and *ready*," etc., says the provost; but that "if" makes a great difference. Be this as it may, we should like to know who reads the "compositions" at the University of Pennsylvania, and whether its *syntax* is as much a matter of fancy as its orthography. Probably none will wonder, however, that an educator so careful of the feelings of his students, especially while engaged at their recitations, and who knows so well how to use the English language so as to render it astonishing "if rightly apprehended," should be complimented by one of the principal orators of the inauguration, in the following handsome manner:

> "The University has entered upon a new era. Its *learned* provost (to whom I acknowledge my obligations for *most interesting information* in regard to the College) and its *able* professors stand ready to sustain and advance its *well-earned reputation*."

To this we can only add the following small specimen of the style in which the "memorial windows" receive their finishing touches:

> "Next in order of time must be named the great mechanician and astronomer, David Rittenhouse. This very remarkable man deserves something more than a passing notice.
>
> "He was *not only an American*, but a *native of this county, and was born upon the 8th of April*, 1732. *in the then township of Roxborough. now in the Twenty-first Ward of the city of Philadelphia.* His great-grandfather, William, established about the year 1690 the first paper mill in British America, upon a small stream called 'Paper-mill Run,' in Roxborough. When the subject of this sketch was 17 years of age he made a wooden clock, and soon after constructed a twenty-four hour clock.
>
> "Such mechanical *genius could not be overlooked or neglected*,

and his *wise father* soon purchased for him such tools as were required in the business of clockmaking" (!)

Every friend of science has an affectionate respect for the memory of David Rittenhouse; but we think that only a few entertain that feeling because "*he was not only an American*, but a *native of this county*," etc. That his "wise father soon purchased for him such tools as were required in the business of clockmaking," is also a fact "of great significance" in its bearing on the University of Pennsylvania "if rightly apprehended," although it seems that his father was a little too "wise" to intrust his education to that institution!

But both the time and space which we had prescribed for this article are exhausted. We cannot conclude, however, without urging on all whom it may concern that, although fine speeches and mutual laudation may be very agreeable things to those who take part in them, they make no scholars. They are much more likely to make empty boasters, and are far too suggestive, especially in connection with the "memorial windows," of the well-known lines of Goldsmith:

> "Hence *ostentation* here with *tawdry art*
> Pants for the vulgar praise which fools impart."

Another fact equally certain is, that if Ignorance tries to hide its head like the ostrich, at the present day, like the ostrich, will it find the effort a fruitless one. If, upon the other hand, the University of Pennsylvania will arouse itself, and devote itself really to its proper work, setting aside such of its Faculty as are incompetent or hopelessly lazy, and putting in their place men who possess the necessary energy and enthusiasm, as well as the necessary learning and ability—in short, men who are so conscious of performing their work faithfully and well that they do not care who sees it, or who examines its results—then none will be more happy than we to award it its full meed of praise. In the meantime, we can only suggest that the following distich from Euripides be inscribed in legible characters on a conspicuous slab or shingle, over the main entrance to the new building, until all the graduating students are able to translate it without having to look to their dictionary for more than half the words:

οὐ γάρ τι τοῖσιν ὠσὶ τερπνὰ χρὴ λέγειν,
*ἀλλ' ἐξ ὅτου τις εὐκλεὴς γενήσεται.**

ART. VI.—1. *Histoire d'Italie.* Par GUICHARDINI.

2. *Burchardt's Diarium.*

3. *Histoire du Pape Alexandre VI.* Par L'ABBÉ JORRY. Paris, 1851.

4. *Etudes critiques sur l'Histoire d'Alexandre VI.* SAINT BRIENO. 1850.

5. *Histoire des Papes.* Par J. CHANTREL. Paris, 1862.

6. *Dublin Review*, No. XC, January, 1859. Art. "History in Fiction."

BEFORE presenting to our readers the article to which the above works serve as a heading—an article written by a zealous Catholic—we think it proper to make an observation or two. We would never have chosen Alexander VI. as a subject for discussion, because we could not see that any good would result from our doing so. We could not have presented the character of that pontiff as in any manner exemplary; and to have presented it in the opposite light would have offended many without affording much edification to any. It is true that only the bigots among Catholics or Protestants would have allowed themselves to be much excited by it in one way or the other; but it is our wish to calm rather than excite even that unhappy class. Accordingly, we have always made it a point to avoid, as much as possible, whatever has any tendency, however indirect or remote, to create sectarian animosity, or give offence to any sect as such.

Regarding the subject in any other light, the Pope is no more exempt from criticism, in our estimation, than any king or emperor. We have never pretended to any one that we regard his Holiness as infallible in any sense; but we have always respected, and shall continue to respect, both the opinions and the feelings of those who do. Most cheerfully do we admit, that, with very few exceptions, the popes have been good men, very much superior to lay sovereigns. We admit, moreover, that in general the popes have more than compensated the world for whatever wealth it has given them, and for whatever power it has intrusted them with.

---

* *Hipp.* 488.

But in each respect Alexander VI. must forever be regarded, by all impartial minds, whether Catholic or Protestant, as forming a hideous exception. Our view of his case, however, in its bearing on Catholicism has long been this: we think that the conduct of Alexander VI. no more impugns Catholicism than the conduct of Judas Iscariot impugns Christianity.

Convinced thus, that, far from being saintly or infallible in any sense whatever, Alexander VI. was really a fraud on the Church, we informed the esteemed author of the article to which these remarks are intended to serve as a preface, that it was impossible for us to accept his views as correct, and that we could not ask our readers, even by implication, to believe what we could not believe ourselves without setting at naught all reliable history and biography since that pontiff's time, which devote any attention to his character. But the author protests. He urges that there are many reasons why his article should receive a place in a journal professedly and confessedly impartial; that the cause of justice and truth, as well as of true religion, demands that it should, it being, as he is sure, a complete vindication of Alexander VI.

In our opinion it were not well for the Catholic Church that it should be accepted as a vindication or rehabilitation of that pontiff; because it is impossible to regard Alexander VI. as innocent without coming to the conclusion that the greatest and best archbishops and cardinals of his time were utterly unworthy of belief. Had nothing been laid to the charge of that pontiff but his alleged undue fondness for the beautiful sex, the world would not have hesitated nearly four centuries to forgive him. But if he was not guilty of murder and assassination, in their worst forms, as well as of simony, tyranny, etc., those of his own bishops and cardinals who knew him best must be set down as base falsifiers and calumniators. Thus, for example, his worst accuser is Burchardt, who had long been his master of ceremonies, and who died Bishop of Colta di Castillo. In order to avoid, as much as possible, bringing scandal on the Church, which only had to endure for a time the misfortune of having such a head—though not without making strong efforts to cast off the incubus—Burchardt wrote his famous Diary (*Diarium*) in Latin, in which only the educated and those capable of comparing Alexander VI. to Judas, without condemning the Church for having such a pope, any more than they would condemn Christ for having such a disciple, could read it.

We may remark in passing that it is very much the habit with that class of our Protestant brethren who derive their knowledge from hearsay, to regard the monks as only bigoted, idle drones; yet, in all ages of the Church, they have been the chief reformers. They were so in the time of Alexander VI. To their honor, it may be said, that there was no monastery in which letters were cultivated which did not raise its voice against that pontiff. Instance that of Bologna, whence issued Savonarola. But what was the good Brother's fate? Alexander offers him a cardinalate on condition that he be blind to his iniquities, or, at least, refrain from denouncing them. The honest and intrepid prior disdainfully declines the proffered bribe. He persists in his fierce denunciations, although he has seen one critic after another tortured and even put to death* for merely writing an epigram on the Borgia iniquities. All are familiar with the case of Lorenzo, the Venetian poet. It was equally notorious that those who wrote nothing, but merely indulged in satirical remarks at the Borgia infamies, were liable to be seized upon at any moment, thrown into a dungeon, and have both tongue and hand cut off and exhibited at the prison window pinned to each other, as a warning to all satirically inclined! The fate of the unfortunate Mancinnellus illustrates this but too fully.

---

* *Vide* Burchardt, p. 197. Tomasi, p. 197; also Cardinal Bembo. *Hist. Venet.* vol. ii., p. 217, *et seq.*

But nothing could frighten Fra Savonarola. It was not so easy to seize him, however, as the poor wandering poet. All that can be done for a while is to excommunicate him. That sentence is duly passed May 12, 1496. But the monk remains undaunted. In March, of the following year, he is forbidden to preach. He still denounces assassination, simony, plunder, and indiscriminate, open debaucheries as infamous, and at the same time observes so little precaution in regard to his personal safety, that he is seized upon and cast into a dungeon, April 8, 1498, and on the 23d of the following month he is hung and burnt!

Now, if it be remembered that only fourteen years had elapsed after the death of Alexander, when Luther, another monk, a scholar and educator, posted on the door of his convent his celebrated theses against the papacy, it may be judged by the most thoughtless whether Catholics should have any desire or taste to vindicate the character of Alexander VI. As for Leo X., who wore the tiara in Luther's time, he would have done honor to any age or country, by his noble, munificent liberality in favor of every project whose object and tendency were the development and enlightenment of the human mind. But whereas Leo X. opened his private purse freely for the benefit of whatever was good and needed his aid, Alexander VI. stopped at nothing by which money was to be made. Accordingly, Cardinal Gilles di Viterbo closes an elaborate estimate of his character, also written in Latin, with the painful assertion that under the rule of that pontiff no one was safe in his house, in his castle, in his bed; that Alexander VI. recognized no law, human or divine; that with him gold, brute force, and debauchery, ruled all. "*Non in domo, non in cubiculo, non in turri tutus; nihil jus, nihil fas; aurum, vis, et Venus imperabant.*"* In performing a similar duty to posterity and to the Church, the learned Cardinal Bembo, Latin secretary to Leo X., expresses himself as follows: "This simony had attained such proportions that in order to remedy so great an evil the secular princes were obliged to forbid their subjects, under pain of perpetual banishment, to go to Rome to purchase any benefice."*

---

* Tom. Tomasi, p. 290.

These were our reasons for not wishing to have anything to do with the vindication or rehabilitation of Alexander VI. Still, as the gentleman desirous of becoming his vindicator so earnestly claims a hearing before our readers, we make room for his defence in its integrity, only repeating the remark that no Catholic has any more reason to blush for the conduct of Roderick Borgia than he has to blush for the conduct of Judas Iscariot. If the disciples of Christ were nothing the worse for having had a Judas amongst them, neither were the popes anything the worse for having had a Roderick amongst them. Surely, none have the less esteem or veneration for Pope Pius IX., or for any of his predecessors who have led a life equally good and exemplary, because they know that Alexander VI. was much more like Nero than like St. Peter, or any other saint worthy of the name.

Having thus given our views, though necessarily only in a hurried way, in the interest of the truth and justice of history —history, too, as written by archbishops and cardinals who have confessedly led a blameless life—at the same time disclaiming all intention of wounding the religious susceptibilities of any one, we allow our contributor to make the best of his case, and disprove, if he can, even one of the principal charges made by archbishops and cardinals, as well as monks of unimpeachable character:

"Vendit Alexander claves, altaria, Christum."

PERHAPS few studies in ancient times have afforded more striking or more important results than that of history and biography in their original sources. It need hardly be remarked that the effect of this has been to reverse several opinions which, for a long time, were received as settled historical facts. The researches in this field have, as yet, only begun; but, judging from the success of those who have only partially traversed it, the student who will still more explore and minutely reëxamine it, who will in truth cultivate it, will reap from it a harvest of imperishable laurels.

---

* *Hist. Venet.* Bembo, vol. ii, p. 210.

The original sources of biography are various; indeed it may be examined from different stand-points, but one of these is the examination, not so much into the facts or occurrences related, as into the characters of the merits of the original narrators who have recorded them; or, in other words, it is an examination of their moral characters, and consequently of their truthfulness, or the contrary—for it need scarcely be remarked that the testimony of an enemy, or of a suborned witness, is commonly, if not always, worthless.

It was by a study of the kind just referred to—that is to say, by the diligent examination and collation of original Spanish and Italian documents, and of the moral character of certain writers—that Rosilly De Lorgues, in his "Life of Columbus," shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that the several accusations made against the illustrious discoverer of the New World, and particularly the one of his not being married to the mother of his son Fernando, are sheer calumnies, wholly destitute of any original support.

To utter the name of Alexander VI. is it not at once to recall a series of crimes and infamies upon which the most prudent course for a Catholic writer who values his reputation, would be to observe what may be called a dignified silence? To try to defend the infamous Borgia, is it not to undertake a task as culpable as it is vain and nugatory?—or rather is it not like stirring up certain matters which the more they are stirred the more offensive they become to the olfactories? State, if you will, some of our Catholic friends will say to us, that the crimes of Alexander VI. cannot justly be attributed to the Church or even to the Papacy, because the vices of the private man do not nullify the sacred character of the Pontiff; state further, if you have the desire to do so, that the divineness of the promises made to the Church are found precisely confirmed by this miracle, for it is nothing less than a miracle that she has been able to withstand and overcome so much infamy and perversity; but do not endeavor to rehabilitate a name and memory justly doomed to eternal dishonor!

These counsels, however well meant, shall not stop us. Above all things, it is the truth that we love, and that claims our homage and devotion ; it is the truth that we wish to defend and vindicate, and we trust we shall not permit ourselves to be swayed from doing so, either by prejudice or by fear. Like M. Chantrel, whose name appears at the heading of this article, and most others who flattered themselves that they were fully conversant with the subject, in early life we conceived a hearty detestation for the memory of Alexander VI. Leaving to the enemies of the Catholic church the enjoyment of the luxury caused by this hideous blemish on the Papacy, we lamented with deep regret the scandal, but consoled ourselves with the reflection that Christ had predicted that scandals should come, and even taught or indicated their necessity. But in 1859 a total change took place in our ideas regarding this pope, in consequence of having read, in the January No. of the Dublin Review for that year, an article entitled "History in Fiction;" the burden of which was the shameful injustice done to the memory of that pontiff. Later in life, from thoughtful reflection and a more extended course of studies, and seeing that, by diligent and thorough investigation, the greater part of the scandalous charges with which certain writers filled what they were pleased to designate as histories of the papacy, began one by one to disappear ; and further, seeing the memories of some greatly calumniated sovereign pontiffs gloriously rehabilitated, by Protestant historians, such as Hunter, Voight, Roscoe, Ranke, and some others, we asked ourselves the question, Was it possible that the fifteenth century could have endured for eleven years a Pope so depraved, so odiously infamous, as Alexander VI. is reported to have been? A doubt, which no sincere person will pronounce to have been ill-founded, took possession of our mind, and soon after the doubt came the full conviction that the scandals, if there were any at all, were at least grossly exaggerated. M. Chantrel states that even Voltaire, who was by no means sparing of the character of Alexander, justified these doubts in relation to him, by reproaching Guicardini with having "deceived the whole of Europe" in regard to the death of that pope, and with having too easily believed "the inspirations of his own envenomed hatred."

The doubt referred to having taken possession of our mind, it became in some sense a necessity for us to seek for a solution of the extraordinary historical problem that here presented itself. We made what we considered the necessary researches. We found Roscoe generously and nobly engaged in the work of vindicating this much-maligned pontiff, in rectifying a large number of errors connected with him, and in repelling or dissipating a large number of calumnies circulated of him. Further, ascending to primitive sources, we found that all the accusations made against Alexander came originally from persons who were notoriously his enemies, or who were hired to defame him; and that many of these accusations mutually contradicted or invalidated each other. On an attentive perusal of the famous *Diarium* of Burchardt (if he was the author of it), which is so often referred to as testimony against Alexander, one will be surprised to find that he drops as untenable a large number of the charges preferred against that pontiff by his other accusers.

M. Chantrel, the writer to whom we are most indebted for the matter of this article, and who, like ourselves, was once, as already stated, a hearty detester of Alexander, mentions among the incidents of his own conversion to the cause of that pontiff, the following one: "A recent pamphlet written by an enemy (of Alexander's), but who still forced himself to be just, completed our conversion, or conviction." Such certainly was not the object of the author, M. la Rochelle, when he wrote his pamphlet, *Sur les Droits du Saint-Siége; Alexander VI. et César Borgia;* but seeing that this enemy of the popes and of their temporal sovereignty was forced to acknowledge that Cæsar Borgia endeared himself to and was beloved by the people whom he had delivered from their tyrants, and further, nobly avowed that most of the crimes with which Alexander VI. has been charged never had any existence at all, we felt sustained and strengthened in our change of opinion.

Our own conviction on this subject is fully and, we may say, irrevocably formed. We believe that henceforward nobody can sincerely represent Alexander VI. as a monster, as a second Nero encircled with the tiara, or as an assassin or a debauchee. We fully believe that he was a worthy pontiff and a great temporal prince, and that Catholics have no real cause to blush at his name. And as his memory will appear more and more untarnished in proportion as we study more attentively and impartially his history, and that of his times (we mean their real history), and study more carefully the circumstances amid which he acted, we by no means despair of seeing one day the gravest historians repeat, in accordance with the Dublin Review, that Alexander VI. has been calumniated in almost everything, as was the case before him with St. Gregory VII., Innocent III., and Boniface VIII., with this sole difference, that he has been more thoroughly and persistently thus dealt with than they were.

In our times a reference is often made to the pontificate of Alexander VI. The enemies of the papacy, who would destroy its temporal sovereignty, in order the more surely to undermine its spiritual authority, pretend that the temporal sovereignty ascends really only to this pontiff, and that this is a sorry origin for a power which the Catholics hold or pretend to be sacred. To this charge Catholics may well and truthfully reply, that they have seen this sovereignty in germ in the apostolic times, show itself plainly under the first Christian emperors, and become still more developed under the iconoclast emperors, to become completely established in the eighth century, by a growth slow but sure, which Catholics would deem a mark of the divine will, but which those who reject the idea of a Providence would call the march of events. This temporal sovereignty having become enfeebled in the course of time, Alexander VI. only prepared the way for its consolidation, by rendering powerless the petty tyrants who, like Victor Emanuel of the present day, seized on and oppressed the States of the Church. Julius II. finished what Alexander had begun, and henceforth was consolidated that monarchy which gave a tranquility of three centuries' duration to the Romans.

It is evident then, that pontifical royalty does not date from Alexander VI. and that if it did, as will presently be seen, it would by no means have a shameful origin, since it is not true that he was an unworthy pontiff, though with M. De Lorgues we are willing to allow, that, upon the whole, he was the least worthy of the Popes.

The writers who have particularly treated of Alexander VI. may be divided into three classes: enemies, defenders, and those who are indifferent—that is to say, neither friends nor enemies. Among the first class, the only one we will now advert to, we mention: 1. Francis Guichardini or Guiciardini in his History of Italy. 2. Burchardt in his *Diarium* or Journal of Alexander VI. 3. Paul Jove, who wrote a history of his times. 4. Tomaso Tomasi, author of a history of Cæsar Borgia. 5. Machiaveli, a secret enemy but an open admirer of the same Borgia. To these original witnesses, or defamers, must be added the following writers, who used them for the purpose of criminating Alexander, to wit: Voltaire and his whole school; M. Mary Lafon, in his *Rome moderne;* M. Challamel, in his History of the Popes; an anonymous writer, in his *Rome et Paris, ou la Question romaine;* M. La Rochelle, in the pamphlet we lately mentioned; and, finally, Bianchi Giovini, in an infamous pamphlet bearing the title of *Il Diario di Burcardo, Quadro del costumi della corta di Roma.* We cannot, at present, spare space or time to advert particularly to the defenders of our pontiff or to the large class who are indifferent in regard to him.

The *Critical Studies* of M. Favé, a work which is by no means as much known as it deserves to be; the work of the Abbé Jorry; and the article already referred to of the Dublin Review, in our estimation settle the question, and can leave no doubt that Alexander has been the victim of an odious conspiracy of calumnies.

Catholics who have a horror for lies, and who cannot comprehend to what a degree malignity and impudence are capable of exciting the hatred of some of their adversaries, are often induced to make all the concessions which do not compromise faith itself; more than one of them even, after having read this essay, will still hesitate to believe that calumny has been so audacious in regard to Alexander VI., and probably they will say that there must surely be some truth, however small it may be, where there are so many accusations against a pope of the latter part of the fifteenth century. The adage will occur to them: Where there is smoke there is fire. They will unhesitatingly believe that Voltaire and his disciples, and even some fiery Protestants of the sixteenth century, would not, when needful for their object, shrink from resorting to falsehoods and to the most audacious fabrications; but how admit for a moment that historians like Guichardini and Paul Jove, and a familar acquaintance of Alexander's like Burchardt, who died Bishop of Cotta di Castello, could have been able to forge calumnies to the extent they have done, if that pontiff were really innocent?

We will answer these objections by showing the degree of credence the writers merit who form as it were the arsenals—that is to say, the sole original sources—whence the enemies and defenders of Alexander have drawn their arms and ammunition, and in doing so we shall make some strange revelations.

Machiaveli may surely first and foremost be rejected as a witness, whom no person who knows his character would accept; he is well known. This Florentine, who passed a great part of his life in conspiracies, and another in writing unchaste comedies, is the author of a work entitled *The Prince*, which has become the manual of conspirators, of the ambitious, of cheats and of rascals. His expressed admiration of Cæsar Borgia, whom he secretly hated, would have been of itself an accusation if not a condemnation of that personage, if one could trust the good faith of Machiaveli. Still it is evident, from his recital, that Cæsar in many cases acted from the sheer force of the most imperious necessity, and certainly it is not in Machiaveli that one finds materials for the calumnies with which the memory of Alexander has been so shamefully tarnished.

Guichardini was also a Florentine. He was only twenty years old when Alexander VI. died. Educated and trained, doubtless, by a disciple of Savonarola, of that extraordinary monk whom a Catholic would be disposed to rank among the holiest of reformers, if he had not put himself in opposition to the Holy See, he imbibed deeply the prejudices and anger of the Florentine monks of that time against Alexander. To have an idea of his good faith and impartiality when speaking of the sovereign pontiffs, let it suffice to say, that he represents throughout his work St. Gregory VII. as the vile paramour of the Countess Matilda, and that he designates as bastards the legitimate children Innocent VIII. had before he entered the priesthood.

The bad faith of this writer is such, that the infidel Bayle says in his *Dictionnaire Philosophique*: "Guichardini deserves to be detested; he is guilty of the fault of scandalmongers," and that Voltaire himself accuses him of imposture in relation to the death of Alexander. Moreover, we have the judgment of Guichardini himself in regard to his book—a judgment given in the face of death, and which therefore can be questioned by nobody. Some time before his death, he sent for a notary to dictate to him his last will and testament. The notary having asked him what was to be done with his "History of Italy" which he left in manuscript, he answered: "Let it be burned." We do not question the brilliant qualities of this historian, but have we not every right to reject him when he appears as a witness against a pope?

Paul Jove merits no more credence than does Guichardini in what regards Alexander VI. He was a venal and untruthful writer, who boasted that he wielded two pens — one of gold, the other of iron—to write of princes according to the favors or disfavors he received from them. Bayle, in his *Dictionnaire*, thus speaks of him: "Giacomo Gohorri has no hesitation in saying that the adventures of Amadis de Gaul are as real and truthful as the histories of Paul Jove. According to Vossius he set on foot or opened what he called a bank, and promised an ancient pedigree and an immortal glory to any knave who would pay him well for his labor; while, on the contrary, he mercilessly defamed those who would not pay him for his falsehoods."

Tomaso Tomasi, as we are informed by M. Favé, was a countryman of Guichardini and of Paul Jove. He seems to have proposed to himself two prime objects: one, to pay court to and gain the favor of the Duchess of Florence, a princess of the family of the La Roveres, by vilifying the pope, whom the cardinal of St. Peter-in-Chains had contended with; the other, to show in Cæsar Borgia a picture of monstrosity which the most dissolute imagination could not well conceive. This is what in other terms has been said by Antoine Varillas in his history of Louis XII.

One more yet remains, namely: John Burchardt, once master of ceremonies at the Court of Rome. We will now see what credence the *Diarium*, or journal, which goes under this worthy's name, merits, and the opinion that may be formed of it. Burchardt died in a quiet obscurity, and few persons were aware that he had written anything, when one hundred and ninety years after his death, in 1636, a French Calvinist came to present to Leibnitz, in the city of Hanover, some detached leaves, some written in French, others in Italian, and still others in Latin. Leibnitz believed, or affected to believe, that he discovered in them some fragments of the *Diarium* of Burchardt, and published them in his "Secret History," expressing in a preface his regret that he had not been able to procure the original text of Burchardt. Eleven years later, in 1707, La Croze found what he considered, or pretended to consider, the *Diarium* in a library in Berlin, and Jean Eccard published it in 1723, in tom. ii. of his *Corpus historicum medii ævi.* This *Diarium* differs in some important points from that published by Leibnitz. Where is the authentic version, if such be in existence? and what authority, we would ask, can be assigned to a journal written against a Pope, when it is found or discovered only by Protestants, in Protestant libraries, and edited by Protestants? Besides, these are not the only editions of it that exist; others are found which are equally discordant, and M. Chantrel says that the versions likewise, in several places, mutually contradict each other. Is it then, we would ask, on the authority of such a book, of an authenticity so questionable, and of an integrity or truthfulness still more questionable, that a serious accusation can be founded?

But it will be objected that one may at least receive as truth the parts of the different manuscripts that agree among themselves. Be it so! It remains still to be seen what credence the author himself deserves. Now here is what Paris de Grassis says of him:* "Not only was he no man, but he was the most detestable of beasts; moreover, he was very wicked and very spiteful. He has written books which nobody can comprehend, unless it be a sybil, or the devil, his accomplice; he has written them in characters so illegible, with so many erasures and alterations, that I verily believe he had the devil aiding him." This Paris de Grassis was a canon of Bologna, and, at a later period, bishop of Pesaro. His authority then, if it does not nullify or neutralize that of Burchardt, at least permits us to have serious doubts of the latter.

But the book of Burchardt, such as it has descended to us, bears about it characters of falsehood and stupidity which of themselves would suffice for us to adopt the judgment of the canon of Bologna. Audin, estimating the work solely by itself, thus judges the author: "In reading him, one would think he never quitted the pope for a single instant: he follows him to the chapel, to the consistory, to table, to bed; night has no darkness the obscurity of which he cannot penetrate. He is a person who does not believe in the existence of virtue, and who, by the omnipotence of a ducat, would ordinarily explain away a good thought or a good action. Never did a romancer, with a naïvety so comical, sport with the credulity of his readers. Of Alexander VI., who, according to him, was dissimulation itself personified, he makes the chief personage of a melodrama which publishes its dissoluteness to the whole Roman people. Only let a cardinal die, and forthwith he examines the drink of the deceased, and almost always finds in it some traces of poison. What was this poison for? It was because Alexander wished to possess himself of the riches of the cardinal. Voltaire, as a tragic poet, has acutely jeered at this violation of the first rules of the dramatic art. "It has been pretended," says he, "that in a pressing need for money, Alexander desired to succeed to the estates of some cardinals, but it is certain that Cæsar Borgia took away a hundred thousand ducats of gold of the treasure of his father. The need for money then was not real. Besides, how was it possible to have been mistaken about that bottle of poisoned wine, which it is said caused the death of the pope? If, when the pope died, the cause of his death had been known, it certainly would have been so by the very persons whom it was intended to poison; they would not have left such a crime unpunished; they would not have suffered Cæsar Borgia to obtain peaceable possession of his father's treasure. * * * It is not difficult to invent falsehoods when one is determined to accuse."

---

* Ex Diario ad annum 1506.

If we could believe the narration of Burchardt, Alexander VI. must have been stricken with idiocy. He would have been the Cassandra of a comedy, seeking expressly the light of broad day to render a city, a country, the whole world witnesses of his follies, a cretin of Maurianna, exposing to view, on the highways, his disgusting sores. Never did a tattler of the feminine gender utter such silly stories as did this master of ceremonies. One would say that to fill his pages he played the part of a *fucchinio*, roaming about the streets, the market-places, the shops and the stalls, and of all that he could hear from the lips of valets, of waiters, of grooms, of barbers, making entries the evening of each day, and calling these entries his journal!*

Such is the man who has furnished the materials to those who defamed Alexander VI. Yet it is a remarkable fact that this same Burchardt, who has been made so much of, furnishes also materials for the defence of this pope from more than one grave accusation. "There are still pearls in this dunghill of Burchardt's," adds Audin further; but precious care is taken not to bring them to light. Thus, little or nothing is said of the appeal of Alexander to the Christian world to repulse the Turk who menaced the west, and whose triumph would have been the grave of letters and every other vestige of civilization. This certainly was a noble and glorious idea! Conformably to his rigorous sense of justice, this pope put under contribution the riches of his cardinals. Ascagna Sforza, who had funds amounting to thirty thousand ducats, was obliged to pay three thousand into the treasury instituted for that purpose by Alexander; Cardinal Medici, afterwards Leo X., only six hundred, the tenth of his annual revenue; Carnaro had to pay nothing, because, says the journal of Burchardt, he had no income—*nullos habet redditus.* Yet this Carnaro was one of the cardinals whom Alexander wished to poison!

---

* Audin, History of Leo X., chap. xi.

Many other accusations made against this pope are refuted by the Journal of Burchardt, whether it be that he mentions the things differently from the other defamers of Alexander, or that his silence in regard to other accusations shows their falsity. Thus, Tomaso Tomasi seeks to make the Borgias responsible for the murder of Alphonso of Arragon. The *Diarium* of Burchardt does not say a word to confirm this suspicion. Tomasi speaks of pamphlets come from Germany, and relates some scenes of immorality which had taken place at the banquets at which Alexander and Cæsar Borgia attended. The *Diarium* nowhere speaks of these scenes, and yet it makes mention of the pamphlets, and says that one of them was shown to the pope, undoubtedly to make known to him the length to which the malignity of his enemies went. Examples of this kind could be abundantly adduced.

It is now fully seen that we must distrust everything that has been written disparagingly to Alexander. And we think we have been able to convey to the minds of our readers the full conviction that we must not only distrust them, but that we must absolutely reject them. Thus we see that it is possible to justify him against all the charges brought against him, and certainly it must be the duty of every sincere-minded and truth-loving person to do so upon every becoming occasion. But we should not confine ourselves to this negative defence of him; justice demands that we should go further. Alexander VI. has been neither a debauchee nor a cruel and perfidious prince, nor a scandalous pontiff; he was, on the contrary, a great temporal prince and a remarkable pontiff, and we believe that the Dublin Review speaks the truth when it says: "There is positive testimony to be rendered in favor of his character—testimony as irreconcilable with the accusations brought against him, as if they had been brought against Gregory VII. himself. The *Bullarium* of this great pontiff has a remarkable value; the list of his letters and other writings, composed during a pontificate as short as it was troublous, is long and very varied, and attests at once his ability, his energy, his talent." * * *

The true basis upon which the defence of Alexander ought to be placed is this: All the accusations brought against him may be summed up in this one, that he employed Cæsar Borgia to defend the pontifical dominions by force of arms against the Italian princes and their foreign allies. What proves that such is the case, is the very significant fact, that those who attack him most do so chiefly on account of Cæsar, and show that they do not admit it, or, at least, that they pretend to doubt the legitimacy of defending by force of arms the pontifical patrimony. The accusations of immorality recall those that were laid to the charge of the Gregorys VII., the Bonifaces VIII., and the Sixtuses IV., and it is easy to see that they proceed from the envenomed spirit of party, and that they are really refuted by their own improbability, their atrociousness, and the absence of all impartial and disinterested testimony. The only things they mention that can be admitted without reserve, are those which have relation to the defence of that patrimony by force of arms. None of those who acknowledge or admit the legitimacy and importance of this defence attack Alexander. If, then, his cause differs from that of some of his predecessors and successors, it is simply in the degree of calumny with which he has been assailed. And yet it may be doubted whether in this respect there is a difference when one pays attention to the circumstances of the times, and the great opposition which the resentment of contemporary princes excited against our pontiff, the history of which has been corrupted in its very sources by hired historians. When once we give due heed to these circumstances, we find the case of Alexander to be no other than that of the Sixtuses, the Juliuses, the Bonifaces, the Innocents, the Gregorys.

We have, as it were, seen and examined the four sole original witnesses (or their writings) against Alexander, and, before proceeding further, we would beg leave to ask whether there is a court in the whole of Christendom that would receive their testimony, either singly or collectively, in the most trifling case, or rather that would not forthwith scornfully throw it out of court? And surely the person who would receive it against a pope must be sadly afflicted with that mental disease which is called *papaphobia*.

To have a more correct idea of our pope than could be gleaned from the preceding discussions, and whom we trust our readers will henceforth look upon with complacency, if not marked favor, we will now proceed to give a sketch of his life, which will probably be his best defence: There lived in Valencia, Spain, a very ancient family of the name of Borgia, or, rather, Borja, said to have descended from the ancient kings of Arragon. What is certain is that it occupied a distinguished rank in Valencia, and that the name of Borja was given to a city of Arragon. This family had the glory of giving to the Church two popes, Calixtus III. and Alexander II., and a great saint, St. Francis Borgia. A sister of Calixtus III., named Jane or Isabella, married Godfrey Lenzuoli, who was of an equally distinguished family, and perhaps even chief of the younger branch of the family of Borgia. Lenzuoli was intrusted with several important offices, and obtained from the government several marks of favor.

It is not known how many children Godfrey had, but it is probable that he had several, and at least two sons, one of whom was named Peter Louis. As to him who was one day to wear the pontifical tiara, he was born at Valencia in 1431, and received the name of Rodrigo. It appears that Godfrey Lenzuoli added to his own name that of his wife, for it is seen that Peter Louis and Roderick called themselves, indifferently, Lenzuoli or Borgia.

However this may be, Roderick from a very early age gave promise of uncommon abilities, and great aptitude for the management of important affairs. His father confided him to the instruction of the ablest teachers, and had him to continue his studies until the age of eighteen years. He then intrusted to him some important affairs, some legal cases to unravel, and the young man succeeded in them so happily that he thought of entering on a career which commenced with such brilliant prospects. But, endowed with an ardent temperament and a lively imagination, he soon quitted the profession of law to embrace a military career. In this, as in his former one, he soon distinguished himself, and it was thought that military glory, in his estimation, exceeded all others, when the election of his uncle, Alphonsus Borgia, who took the name of Calixtus III., once more changed his views.

Calixtus knew the high qualifications and abilities of his nephew, and desired to have him near him in Rome. Roderick Borgia repaired to that city only with regret, overcome by the pressing solicitations of the pontiff. This was in the year 1546. In order to furnish Roderick with the means of becomingly sustaining his rank, Calixtus gave him, *in commendam*, the archbishopric of Valencia. It was thus that young Borgia became commendatory of that archbishopric, and there would have been no abuse in it unless he had used its revenues contrary to the requirements of religion. Did he do so? Is it true that his conduct at this time rendered him unworthy of the favor and confidence of his uncle, who created him cardinal in the same year, 1456, he being then twenty-five years old? Let us examine this matter.

In the first place, it is to be understood that the cardinalate no more than the *commendam* required that the person who assumed the obligations attached to it should be in holy orders. The commendatory, indeed, was ordinarily a secular; and there is more than one instance of cardinals who had never entered into holy orders, although at present the rule is that a secular becoming a cardinal should at least receive sub-deaconship. But it remains no less true that both the commendatory and the cardinal were always obliged to lead regular lives, and yet Roderick Borgia has been reproached with having, after 1456, as well as before it, led a dissolute and scandalous life.

No candid historian denies or even questions that Calixtus III. was a pious and venerable pontiff; he must, then, have been ignorant of the scandalous irregularities of his nephew in creating him a cardinal, and continuing to him his favor. Was this pontiff deceived in regard to him? It is in relation to this point — that is to say, to the debauchery of Roderick—that Burchardt (if all that is written in the *Diarium* be from his pen), Tomasi, Paul Jove and Guichardini unanimously cry out against the scandal, but they do not agree either about the circumstances or their enormity. Guichardini is the least positive of all, and contents himself with the authority of the expressions, "it is said," or, "it is reported." The others do not uniformly give even the name or the condition of the girl or woman who had had criminal relations with the young military officer—relations which were, it is said, afterwards continued. One of them speaks of Rose or Catherine Vannozza or Zanozza; another makes her a young girl, and still another a married woman. There is no accord among them as regards the name or the *prenomen*, nor yet as regards the condition or rank of this female; nor do they mention who she was, where she was born, or when or where she died. And yet it is the implacable enemies of Alexander—contemporaries as they were—who leave us in such uncertainty and obscurity on a point which it would have been easy to settle, and in the elucidation of which they were themselves personally interested.

Let us admit for a moment that Roderick Borgia had of Vannozza the children it is reported he had of her: namely, first, John or Francis, who became Duke of Candia, a city of the kingdom of Valencia; secondly, Cæsar, the most celebrated of all; thirdly, Jeoffrey, Prince of Squillace; fourthly, the famous Lucretia Borgia; fifth, a child whose name has not descended to us. It follows from the testimony even of his enemies, that he had all these children more than twenty years before he sat on the pontifical throne, and before he received holy orders, which, it appears, did not take place until 1478, when Sixtus IV. nominated him bishop of Alba, and afterwards of Porto. Strictly speaking, then, one may reproach Alexander VI. with the irregularities of his youth, but he can reproach in nothing the ecclesiastic, the bishop, the pope. The irregularities of the military officer, if he has truly repented of and made atonement for them, cannot fall on the priest. Such irregularities have not prevented the Augustins or the Ignatius Loyolas from becoming eminent saints.

But there is another version of this matter which still more completely justifies Alexander. The learned Marini in his *Dictionnaire historique* says, that, according to some respectable historians, this pope had of Julia Farnese, in his youth, four sons and a daughter. Orlandini states the same thing in his history of St. Francis Borgia. It is to be regretted that neither of these authors mentions formally that Julia Farnese was legitimately married to Roderick Borgia, but there are certain facts which leave but little doubt on the subject—that is to say, provided he had any children by her at all. The historian, Philip de Commines, nowhere, in his memoirs, calls the reputed children of Alexander *bastards*, and it is well known that this historian is not sparing of this epithet, even in regard to the children of kings, when there is reason for using it. The tableau of the reign of Charles VIII. compiled from contemporary writers, and inserted in the *Petitot Collection*, also omits this epithet.

If it be probable that Julia Farnese is no other than Vannozza, it becomes equally probable, from the reasons just adduced, that she was united to Roderick in lawful marriage; the interested and often deceptive testimony of Paul Jove, of Tomasi, and of others, could at most only cause some doubt on the subject. But even these doubts disappear when it is remembered that the Farneses were a Roman family on a par with the Borgias, and that an illegitimate union prolonged for so long a time between two members of these houses would have been impossible. If a Farnese had forgotten her honor, her high birth, and her virtue, there can be no doubt that an implacable hatred, an Italian *vendetta*, would for a long time have animated her relatives against her seducer. But it is the exact contrary of this that is shown by history, even as it is given by the very enemies of Alexander. We see Cardinal Farnese, afterwards pope, under the name of Paul III., charged by Alexander with the most delicate and important missions, and devoted to this pontiff at a time when there was a talk of deposing him—that is to say, when Rome was occupied by a French army. Another Farnese, Angelus Ferdinand, served in the army of Cæsar Borgia, and was killed in his service. Have we not, therefore, every reason to believe that if Roderick Borgia had children their birth was irreproachable, that he was legitimately married to Julia Farnese, and that he did not enter into holy orders until after her death?

If the preceding explanation be rejected—an explanation which so naturally accounts for the conduct of Alexander—it will be necessary to admit hypotheses which will lead from one absurdity to another. The enemies of this pope represent him as a man of rare prudence, who sought for whole years to deceive the cardinals in his regard, walking in the streets of Rome with his eyes modestly turned down, passing his days in visiting churches, monasteries, and hospitals, doing all kinds of good works; and yet they would have us believe that this hypocrite, this man so cunning and so prudent, and who prepared himself for so long a time to reach the pontifical throne by the appearance of every virtue, entertained an illegitimate commerce with a woman for several years, led her everywhere he went, acknowledged his children publicly, and finally held to public view his own infamy, and made his scandals a matter of glorification! What inconceivable contradiction! What folly, what incredible audacity! To say of him that he sought to impose on the cardinals by a feigned piety, and that at the same time he acknowledged his bastard children, is to award him a patent for stupidity, and to consider one's readers worthy of being deceived. In wishing to prove too much, the enemies of Alexander have annulled their pretended proofs; their absurd contradictions reduce to nought their testimony.

To readers of good faith who cannot yet bring themselves to believe how such a mass of calumnies could have been invented, we will say with the Dublin Review, "What is really true of Alexander VI. is what but few writers are conversant with. The common crowd of them are contented to accept vulgar tradition; there is not one in a million who thinks of making serious investigations in the matter. The few persons of those who have made them have seen the falsity of the accusations; not only have they found them false, but they have seen that there is not even the least reason for yielding them credence. Never, perhaps, was there less pretext for calumnies than in the case of Alexander. Created a cardinal by a pious and venerable pontiff, he was sent by the able and prudent Sixtus IV. in a critical and important circumstance as a legate to Spain, his native country, where his character ought to have been well known. At the same time, and on a similar mission, France received the celebrated Cardinal Bassarion, whom Protestant writers represent as 'the most learned and eloquent, as well as the oldest and discreetest of the cardinals,' and as 'a man whose demeanor was always conformable to his high dignity.' Is it credible that at the same time the same able and sage pontiff would have employed for a similar mission a debauchee, a man totally depraved? And yet if the idea that is commonly formed of Alexander be just, he was at this period in the very midst of his career of vice! He was in the flower of his age, and in full possession of honors and of power! But this is not all. He had a rival, jealous of his good fortune, Cardinal de Pavia, who was interested in watching closely his conduct, who desired to have the honorable mission with which he was charged, and who sought to injure him by slanders. What, after all, has been said of Alexander? Nothing more than has been said of Beaufort, of Wolsey, of Leo X., of the most distinguished prelates of that period, all accused, like him, of luxury, of ambition, etc. This was precisely twenty years before he was elected pope, and consequently Cæsar and Lucretia, if they were really his children, were then born, and those who accuse him of debauchery tell us that this debauchery was public and notorious at this period of his life!"

It is evident, then, that the simple collection and comparison of pretended facts and dates reduce the calumnies to nothing. Like common perjurers, the calumniators of Alexander have gone too far; they have wished to prove too much. They have gone beyond their object, and thus they have destroyed the confidence they otherwise would inspire. Even Voltaire himself saw clearly into their falsehoods, and jeers at the credulity of those who have believed their absurd and contradictory recitals. And, strange to say, there are still Catholics who believe them, and who are attached with an astonishing tenacity to those false traditions which infidels themselves make objects of their pleasantries!

It remains proved, therefore, that if Alexander VI. had the five children attributed to him, he had them a long time before he became pope, and before he entered into in holy orders, and he had them by legitimate marriage. There was nothing, consequently, in his youth, or in his mature or old age that could have betrayed in him a life of licentiousness or immorality.

We dare go further, and, with the Dublin Review and M. Chantrel, assert, that it is by no means certain that Cæsar, Lucretia, and the others attributed to him, were his children at all. It is an incontestable fact, that nobody heard of his being a father, until after the outburst of indignation against him, caused by his energetic government, although his being so ought to have been public and notorious for at least a quarter of a century. On the elevation of Cæsar to the cardinalate—a dignity which he afterwards resigned or was dispensed from—some witnesses attested on oath that Cæsar and Lucretia were not his children, but, undoubtedly, those of his brother It may be said that these attestations were false, that these witnesses perjured themselves; but it is certain that nobody said so then, and is it not rash and unreasonable to reject testimony thus given under the sanction of an oath, because of contrary assertions made later by interested or inimical parties? It is well known that it was the custom of the popes, in those troublous times, to choose as a general some one of their relations, most commonly a nephew possessing energy and military talents, to defend the pontifical domains against the ambitious princes that surrounded them, and who continually sought to invade them. It was also the custom of the popes to give these relations the name of *sons*, and such, in all probability, is the only base upon which the spirit of enmity supported its original suspicions or calumnies. It need hardly be remarked that the terms *son* and *daughter* and their correlative one, *father*, are the ordinary terms of address between all ecclesiastics of the Catholic Church and their flocks, and that those terms are understood in their spiritual sense.

It will be seen that if we attempted to show positively that the children attributed to Alexander were not his, but his brother's, we should labor under the well-known difficulty of proving a negative, a thing we will not attempt to do. Let it suffice, for the present, to say that there are other insuperable difficulties to the admission that he had any children at all, the statement and discussion of which would lead us beyond the limits intended for this article.

But to pass from this digression, what was the every-day life of this pontiff, who has been represented as possessed of the demon of voluptuousness and infamy? How did this debauchee, who sought the most hideous refinements of vice, pass his days and nights? We have here before us what is acknowledged by even the historians themselves, who give such hideous representations of him.

Alexander was upwards of sixty years of age when he was unanimously elected pope. The habits of sobriety and of labor which he had imposed on himself, notwithstanding his advanced age, gives little favor to the reputation for debauchery which has been given him. The energetic measures which he took against corrupt functionaries testify to his love for justice. "Under Alexander VI." says Audin, who in this judgment followed the contemporary historians, "the poor as well as the rich could obtain justice in Rome; the people, soldiers, and citizens testified great attachment to him, even after his death, because he had qualities truly kingly. At night, he scarcely slept two hours, and from the table he passed almost like a shadow without having waited there. Never did he refuse listening to the complaints of the poor; he paid the debts of unfortunate debtors, and showed himself without pity for prevaricators." *

This would be the place—did space permit—to say something in favor of Cæsar and Lucretia Borgia, if for no other reason than to show the injustice of Pope in the well-known lines:

> " If plagues and earthquakes break not heaven's design,
> Why then a Borgia or a Cataline?"

But we can the more readily pass them by, inasmuch as they—and particularly Lucretia—have already been ably and victoriously defended by such writers as Roscoe and M. Chantrel. But to return once more to Alexander. The high estimation in which he was held by his illustrious contemporary Christopher Columbus, who knew well his character, may be inferred from the fact that Columbus dedicated to him the journal he kept, in the form of Cæsar's Commentaries, of that wonderful voyage of his, which was the most important to civilization and science that ever was made by man. And it is much to be regretted that that journal has not descended to us.

From the 4th of May, 1493, Alexander had to adjudicate in the contending claims of Spain and Portugal in regard to their discoveries. It was the universal belief of that period, that the earth pertains to God, and the common custom, the settled jurisprudence of the age, was to refer to the pope to make the division or apportionment of newly-discovered lands, in order to prevent wars and disputes. Alexander having attentively and thoroughly studied the question, and taken the advice of his cardinals, laid down the famous *Line of Demarkation* by the Bull *Inter cætera*, of which the following is the substance:

"We, by the plentitude of apostolic power, by the authority which God has given us in the person of St. Peter, and in our quality as Vicar of Jesus Christ, whose functions on earth we perform, give and assign by these presents for ever to you and to your heirs and successors, sovereigns of Castile and Leon, all the islands and mainlands discovered or to be discovered by you towards the west and south, in drawing a line from one pole to the other, at a hundred leagues west of the Azores in the direction just mentioned. It is, however, to be understood, that this shall in nothing prejudice the possessions of Christian princes in any discoveries they may have made prior to last Christmas. The condition of this donation or adjudication is, that in virtue of holy obedience to our orders, and in accordance with the promises you have made us, the fulfilment of which we cannot doubt, you shall take good care to send to these countries and islands, learned, virtuous and experienced men to instruct the inhabitants in the Catholic faith and in good morals."

---

* **Audin—Life of Leo X.**

Certainly there is nothing here contrary to the interests of civilization. Instead of inveighing against this bull, "it would be better," as Feller and Count de Maistre observe, "to regret that the time has passed when a single word from the Roman pontiff was sufficient to maintain peace among kings and nations, and when his impartial voice and universally revered influence easily removed the danger of obstinate discussions and sanguinary conflicts."*

It is very strange that no historian or other writer has hitherto noted the remarkable circumstance, that in the magnificent donation which Alexander made to the Spanish sovereigns, he no doubt had largely, if not chiefly, in view the vice-royalty, which he knew had been solemnly guaranteed to Columbus and his heirs forever, and which it is now known would have embraced the whole of America. This is confirmed still more by the fact that when afterwards, previous to the treaty of Tordesillas, he was urgently solicited by the sovereigns of Portugal and Castile to revise—that is to say, change—the line of demarkation, far from complying with their entreaties, he, on the contrary, responded to them by a further concession to Castile, and consequently to Columbus, which has been called the Bull of Extension, *Bula de Extensione.* "When, in his Bull of Partition," says M. De Lorgues, "the Holy Father declared that he had made the donation by the spontaneous impulse of his own liberality, without regard to any entreaty, and acting in virtue of his apostolic plenitude, he uttered a truth no less formal than it was imposing. So, respecting himself, the incomparable donation, given without any exterior impulsion, and in which he himself seemed to recognize the character of a divine favor or benediction, the sovereign pontiff remained immovable in his determination. He rejected the solicitations and the modifications proposed by Spain, as he had rejected the persisting reclamations and obsequious supplications of Portugal. His decision remained as inflexible as a divine decree. * * * His word already existed in time, and was to be as irrevocable as what is passed, or is absolutely unalterable."

---

* Fredet's *Modern History.*

To this we can only add that the greatest saint, as well as the greatest genius and the greatest pope, united in the same person, could not, in our opinion, have acted more becomingly than did Alexander. Indeed, in the whole range of history, we know not an instance of conduct more noble, more imposing, or more admirable, than he displayed on these two memorable and trying occasions.

ART. VII.—1. *De la Littérature, Considéré dans ses Rapports avec les Institutions Sociales*, par MADAME DE STAEL HOLSTEIN. Londres. 1813.

2. *Criticisms on Art*, by WM. HAZLITT. London. 1844.

3. *Voyage en Italie*, par H. TAINE. Paris. 1866.

4. *Modern Painters*, by JOHN RUSKIN. London. 1860.

"LET the dead past bury its dead." In the living present we have a fulness of merit such as the world has never before known, conjoining, as it does, all that was really excellent in the past with a new excellence in the present; and the world, with its full freight of merit in thought and deed, is drifting rapidly toward that future which shall rise rich in the worth of all the ages, in supreme fulfilment of our instinctive strivings after excellence. The modern world has not received full credit for its progress. That it has made marvellous advancement in science and mechanics every one is willing to admit; but the artistic phase of human progress was so richly developed by our remote cousins of Greece, that, as many imagine, there is nothing left for modern artists but to profit by those antique models. The thinking world looks upon the labors of late delvers in the field of art with a half-contemptuous tolerance—willing to admit that there has been no serious retrogradation, but seeing no satisfactory indications of advancement. Yet it may be possible that in this opinion of the superior merit of Hellenic art we have but a one-sided and incomplete view of the case, and that further investigation may unfold decided evidences of human progress, even in this direction.

Development, at least in its mental phase, is never a linear growth. Man's mind is not based on the type of the tree, which moves in a straight line upwards, with successive branching of boughs and twigs; but rather on that of the spiral, in which the curving line seems to stretch off horizontally, only to reappear, when the circle is completed, at a superior elevation. Thus, at any fixed period of human existence, the race appears to be moving in horizontal lines, and centuries must be embraced in the grasp that takes in the upward movement of the spiral.

The simile of the vortex would, perhaps, apply more correctly. Here we have a common centre round which every particle of the mass moves in close curves, now appearing to move inward to, now outward from this centre. So each phase of human thought, at any one period, curves towards, or from a common centre, which centre symbolizes the spirit of the age. The onward movement is not seen in any one branch of human thought, but in this centre of revolution to which all thought is held by attraction of affinity.

From every completed stage of progress human thought moves onward. For a while the mental development of the race appears lost in a chaos of broken curves; thought is all at sea, and the mind, losing the firm ground it has left behind, finds nowhere a resting-place. Gradually we find these curves bending inward; a new centre of movement appears in their midst, and we find that, while apparently stationary or retrograding, the world has been taking a grand stride onward and centering toward a new age, animated by a new spirit.

In that marvellous era of Athenian culture, which alone redeems the past from the charge of barbarism, we have such a completed cycle. We are now in the growth of a new cycle, to which the thought of all enlightened mankind is again rounding inward. There has been a development of seeds that lay unquickened in man's inmost nature; a growth, under the sunlight of modern civilization, of germs that lay dormant through the earlier eras of human progress. The world is not treading in the footsteps of the past. The era of the Olympian deities is now to us but a curious study, the cosmogony of the Greeks a strange phase of the infancy of human thought.

Man's upward movement through time is not from one grade to another of physical development. It is not so much a change in degree as in kind. From the physical he advances into the mental, from the mental into the spiritual domains of thought. The modern world stands not only above, but beyond and apart from the ancient, and is infiltrated with a sentiment alien to the spirit of ancient thought. Everywhere throughout history we see the stepping-stones of this progress. The Dark Ages stand between two widely distinct eras of human development. No strict dividing line can be drawn between the end of the one and the beginning of the other, yet the historian finds that when civilization dawned upon the night of these middle ages Europe had gained a new mental inspiration.

The brain of the past, to speak phrenologically, had only attained a partial development. Man's mentality may be considered as comprising three grand divisions—the animal, the mental, and the spiritual. Of these the animal probably culminated in the remote past, and is displayed more truly in the, so-called, instincts of animals than in any but the lowest grade of human organization. The mental culminated in the cities of ancient Greece, reaching a splendor of manifestation that can never again be attained. For now the animal and mental orders of thought are yielding to the overpowering development of the spiritual, and the human head is slowly rounding to its full harmony of form, as the mind is approaching its fulness of manifestation. No longer does the over-abundant development of the posterior brain draw back the head upon its base and assimilate man's facial aspect to that of the lower animals. Not much longer shall the excessive development of the anterior draw the head forward. For now the superior organs are receiving their development, the head aspires upward, and a just balance between all the organs of the brain is being established.

In illustrating this difference between the spirit of the past and that of the present we find no more significant feature than in the architecture of the two periods. The Grecian temple stands in marble evidence of the character of the Grecian mind. In its rigidly correct curves and straight lines, its severe simplicity and its harmonious proportions it approaches the perfection of pure art, and takes the senses captive by its grace and harmony.

The Greek was essentially a creature of the senses. The world appealed but to his eyes and ears. To him nature culminated in the line of beauty; and his ideal of perfection lay in the three words,* proportion, grace, and harmony. But the human soul began, at length, to break loose from this bondage of the senses, and to seek in nature a response to a higher standard of perfection than that which is susceptible of measurement by eye and ear.

Among the first evidences of this escape from the sensational era of art, is the Corinthian order of architecture, in which the imaginative began to triumph over the logical brain, and that beauty which will not be bound by line or measure to display itself. But this order, though of Hellenic birth, proved alien to the spirit of Grecian civilization. The chaste simplicity of the Doric, the simple elegance of the Ionic were far more pleasing to this geometrically cultivated race; and the Corinthian was but little used in Greece till after the conquest by Alexander, which impressed Grecian logic with a trace of that barbarian imagination, so strongly displayed in the history of the Macedonian conqueror.

---

* *Hazlitt on Art*, p. 350.

Yet the Corinthian was seized on with avidity by the Roman mind, and widely used to adorn the imperial city. The phase of mind which had progressed through long ages of Assyrian, Chaldean, Persian and Egyptian empire, and culminated in the Ionian and the Grecian cities, was passed. The birth of a new era was at hand; and Rome gave the first impulse to that new phase of progress which has not yet reached its culmination. With the Corinthian, their favorite architectural system, the Romans combined the arch and the vault, and in the employment of these aids, as in the forms of their Basilicæ, gave the inception to the Christian architecture of the following ages.

Throughout they displayed a type of mind essentially different from that of the Greeks, replacing the sensual characteristics of the latter by a tendency towards that which impresses the soul rather than the eye. It was as yet but a tendency, but such tendencies are vanes which show which way the winds of thought are beginning to blow.*

The Dark Ages past, we find the logical simplicity of classic architecture displaced by the rich exuberance of the Gothic cathedral—that ornate and grand order, so heedless of simplicity, so full of spiritual significance! Simultaneously in Asia arose the light and intricate Saracenic, an order showing a phase of mental progress markedly different from that of the Gothic. In this we see the gayety and exuberant fancy of the Asiatic mind, as contrasted with the gloomy and imaginative tendencies of Germanic thought. Yet they are alike in spirit, the aspiration displayed in the dome, steeple and pinnacle of the Gothic being paralleled by the springing arch, slender minaret and bubble-like dome of the Saracenic.

---

* "Les Romains avoient cependant plus de vraie sensibilité que les Grecs; les mœurs sévéres conservent mieux les affections sensibles, que le vie licenciéuse a laquelle les Grecs s'abandonnoient."—De Stael, *Littérature*, p. 150.

The characteristic forms of classic architecture are horizontal, reposing, definite; of the Christian, vertical, aspiring, indefinite. Nowhere in the Parthenon can we find a trace of the spiritual or of the aspiring. It is based firmly upon the earth and gravitates downwards in all its dimensions. But the Gothic soars upward in a thousand springing lines, in all its intricacy of arches, in its lofty roof, and the heavenward pointing finger of its spire.* Its informing character is to be seen in no one feature, but in the compound effect of all its elements and in the action of these upon the human mind. In its interior is engendered an involuntary awe, as if the soul of man shrank in the presence of a grander soul.

In Hellenic architecture no such feeling ever arises. It is all of the earth, earthy. It arouses our admiration of harmonious proportions, charms our senses, but fails to awaken in the soul a sense of the unseen and awe-inspiring. In the Grecian temple man looks upon himself with pride at his own greatness; in the Gothic church, with humility at his own littleness.

The Greek looked not upon nature with our eyes. He admired in the forest its sturdy columns, pressing downwards like the limbs of giants upon the earth. We delight in the green arching canopy, borne upward, as it were, by wings, so broadly does it overshadow the trunks beneath. In his architecture he emulated the upright grace of these huge trunks and the horizontal grandeur of the rock arch. The modern mind, on the contrary, seeks to reproduce the effects of the leafy canopy, and to engender within the soul a sense of Nature's simplicity, rather than an admiration of her grace.

It is doubtful that of the expressions of affection toward external nature to be found in heathen writers there are any of which the balance and leading thought cling not to her sensual aspects. Her pleasant influences they received, perhaps, in a more noble way than we, but they found nothing except fear upon the bare mountain or in the ghastly glen. The Hybla heather they loved more for its sweet hives than its purple hues.*

---

* "Egyptian and Greek buildings stand, for the most part, by their own weight and mass; . . . . but in the Gothic vaults and traceries there is a stiffness analogous to that of the bones of a limb or the fibres of a tree, an elastic tension . . . united into every form of nervous entanglement." Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 11, Chap. vi.

There is deep significance in a passage from Homer, describing Ulysses casting himself down upon the rushes and the corn-giving land at the river shore (the rushes and corn being to him only good for sustenance), when we compare it with that in which Dante tells us he was ordered to descend to the shore of the lake as he entered purgatory, to gather a rush and gird himself with it, it being to him not only the emblem of rest, but of humility under chastisement, the rush being the only plant which can grow there. "No plant which bears leaves or hardens its bark can grow on that shore, because it does not yield to the chastisement of its waves."†

Between the sculpture of ancient and modern times there exists the same distinction as between their architecture. Grecian statuary yields us the richest development of the idea of physical beauty and muscular strength. The fathers of art chiselled again and again,in marble, the perfection of the human frame. In the sculpture of Assyria, Egypt, Persia and India we perceive similar efforts to reproduce the physical beauty of man. Through the labors of all these nations we may trace the growth of that art which led up to the marvellous works of Phidias, Praxiteles and their great co-laborers, culminating in the Athene and Zeus of the former, appropriately wrought in ivory and gold, and in the Aphrodite and other remarkable works of the latter. Yet, wonderfully beautiful or grand as many of these works were, it was but beauty of limb and feature, of muscular display or of the rounded lines of youth.

As to imparting to the face a significant expression, or indicating the personality and purpose of the figure otherwise than by the traditional shape and feature, and by the various details of attitude, it was beyond their efforts. It was necessary that they should work in the nude, as it was physical not spiritual expression which they sought to display.

---

* Ruskin, *Beauty*, p. 6. † Ruskin, *Nature*, 116.

Our modern sculptors are strongly bound by the traditional rules, yet they are struggling, weakly, but surely, with a spiritual ideal not seen in ancient statuary. They can often safely clothe their forms, even in the distorting drapery of the present day, for it is more the expression of face than of form which they seek to exhibit. The difference between the two schools is that between the display of body and soul. We admire man as the perfect animal, as the artists of old embodied him in marble. We are beginning to recognize him as the developing angel in the productions of modern art.

In the art of painting the ancient world has left us no example of its perfected style to compare with the wonders of the modern brush. It is better so; the modern painter is bound by no authority older than the mediæval, and must train his soul to no Hellenic rules. Had Greece left us paintings we should have found them as charming in outward effect and as little soul-stirring as are her Apollos and her Aphrodites. We have in the Pompeian relics some imperfect specimens of the labors of the classic brush, which fully bear out the above idea. They are all form, action, pose; nowhere soul or sentiment.

The modern painter has developed not alone the perspective of nature, but the perspective of the human spirit. It is not masks but faces, with souls behind them, that our painters seek to display, and often with remarkable success. The life of the ancient Greeks was spent in cultivating their ideal of physical beauty. Living in a mild climate, with an atmosphere of remarkable serenity, clear-cut mountains and a bright sea, the main features of their country, there was nothing to give rise to the sense of awe and mystery, but everything to produce in them admiration for the beauty of form and motion.

Their standard of human perfection was that learned in the gymnasium. There were ever before the eyes of the Greek youth nude forms of the most striking beauty, displayed in all the graceful movements of their athletic games, and the cultivation of the physical form became to them at once a passion and a science. From the excessive cultivation of this taste, their cities were filled with statuary of which all the expression lay in limb and posture, with temples whose type was that of the sturdy and graceful human limb, and probably with paintings whose excellence lay in their faithful reproduction of the same type of physical beauty.

To the man of the Middle Ages the world had ceased to be a mere exterior shell. He had gained a habit of insight, of introspection, had learned to see in Nature a spiritual depth beneath her physical aspect; in man, less a well-shaped animal than an immortal soul clothed with flesh. The whole of Nature appealed to him with a spiritual significance that rendered its outward frame singularly unimportant, and the race of mystical and deep-revolving minds that arose was in extreme contrast with the hilarious and form-loving Grecian spirit.*

In Italy the battle-ground between the past and the present was established. In this land in which Art first awoke from her long slumber, the influence of the remains of the masterpieces of Roman and Grecian art, with the living force of the Byzantine civilization, was placed in competition with the mystically inclined and highly imaginative German mind. The competing action of these two widely differentiated types of thought is plainly seen in the works of Italian art, and most plainly at that culminating period which is marked by her two greatest names, Michael Angelo and Raphael. The former was essentially the last of the Greeks. His great merit lay in his truth of delineation of the human form. His statues are simply splendid animals, with all the unexpressive calm of the Grecian type of statuary. It was in attitude, form, muscular expression, the truthful reproduction of the physical hero that his power resided.

Raphael, on the contrary, saw the soul under its covering of flesh, and placed upon his works that speaking eloquence of imaginative thought to which his great contemporary never attained. He truly delineated the new spirit that was spreading throughout civilized Europe, and overflowing the few strongholds of ancient thought that lifted their walls against the torrent. The few pioneers of the modern school who preceded him were extinguished in the light of his merit, and the labors of his brush gave an impetus to the art of painting equal to that which Phidias gave to sculpture. Raphael was, like Shakespeare, the exponent of a new, wide phase of human thought, and truly painted " wiser than he knew." *

---

* "On accordoit, dans l'heroisme antique, une grande estime à la force du corps, la valeur se composoit beaucoup moins de vertu morale que de puissance physique; la delicatesse du point d'honneur, la respect pour la foiblesse, sont les idées plus nobles des siecles suivans."—De Stael's *Littérature*, p. 80.

Between these two great souls, who each stand, like Homer, at the beginning of an epoch, a strong phase of similarity exists. The imagination of the father of the modern drama is of the same type of thought as the sensibility of the father of the new-born art of painting, and in them both we see displayed, in forms of beauty destined to be " joys forever," that spirit which animated the Middle Age nations, and which, in a purified and advanced form, is the moving force of modern civilization.†

This comparison between ancient and modern thought could readily be extended so as to include every branch of the higher mental development of the human race, with the same result. Of course such a comparison only applies to men of superior intellect and culture, for it is only these who represent Greece to us, and these only shall represent us to the future. In every epoch there is a superabundance of men existing on the lowest grades of thought. The type of the savage, and that of the " man without a soul," exist plentifully in our highest centres of enlightenment. But it is the uplifted minds that give character to an age, as it is the sparkling crests that form the aspect of the ocean.

And in every age there are souls that reach forward and grasp the spirit of a yet unborn future. We see them in Greece, stretching far onward in thought, and feeling in their souls the impelling spirit of the modern world. We have such souls in our age, reaching forward beyond our ken, and

---

* " The forms of Michael Angelo are objects to admire in themselves, those of Raffaelle are merely a language pointing to something beyond and full of this ultimate import."—*Hazlitt on Art*, p. 176. † Hazlitt, p. 319.

forced to drink the hemlock of popular neglect or persecution. The thoughts of such men are the curved lines of a new vortex whose centre lies far forward, unseen by their contemporaries, but to which the whole world shall surely move forward in its unceasing cycle of development. The mental impulses of such "men beyond their age" are the true connecting links between the different eras of human progress.

The institution of chivalry, with all its concomitants, was the true flower of the Middle Ages, and was only possible to the modern world. It is beyond the stretch of our fancy to conceive of Greece or Rome as indulging in the spiritual frenzy of the Crusades. The whole animating spirit of chivalry was alien to their phase of mentality, and would have appeared to them arrant madness. Animal passion, not spiritual sentiment, possessed and impelled the past. All its enterprises had a strictly logical and defined origin and object. Its wars originated in ambition, cupidity, revenge, or pure blood-thirstiness—always in some phase of animality. Even its grand ideal war, the siege of Troy, was strictly personal in all its objects. Nowhere in its movement enters the sentiment of the impersonal.

During the reign of chivalry, on the contrary, the Christian world became stricken with a madness of the spirit, and Europe surged towards Palestine, why, she knew not, except that the ground made sacred by the Divine presence was desecrated by infidel feet. Jerusalem gained, the impelling sentiment died out, and human greed recovered its footing.

This "new departure" of the human race was not confined to Europe. Previously, in Southwestern Asia, had arisen the great Saracen movement, which, in an incredibly short time, built an empire reaching from India to the Atlantic. Impelled by the same sentiment, a feeling without counterpart in the ancient world, these enthusiastic barbarians rushed from their desert like an avalanche, the first proselyting aggression known in history. It was not earthly but heavenly possessions they fought for, and, like the Crusaders, to the daring of the soldier they added the irresistible force of a grand moral enthusiasm.

This Middle Age spirit that blossomed into chivalry manifested itself otherwise than by producing armies of religious enthusiasts. The sentiment of love and of human fraternity now first rose in its pure, unselfish form. The love songs of the troubadours breathe a new spirit not to be found in the lyric poetry of Greece. The most impassioned utterance of Sappho is simply the appeal of a lover to his mistress. The feeling of personality tinges all their odes. Love was to them a warm-breathed woman, the passion-hearted Paphian goddess; not, as to us, an infinite impersonal attribute of Deity. But in this new song love appears as a pure sentiment, an all-embracing abstraction, an unselfish devotion to an ideal in which is symbolized the whole institution of chivalry.

Love, like art, has its three phases of development. First, the animal, in which only individual desire is considered. To this the word lust more truly applies. It is the feeling that principally animates the brute races, and, to a great extent, the savage races. Mankind had made a great advance in civilization before the second, or mental phase of love fully declared itself. In this, love seeks a mental, not an animal return. It demands the response of a kindred soul, and from it arises the true family relation, in which two souls are united by the links of a mutual regard. Yet, although the sensual basis of savage affection is in great measure replaced by a mental affinity, love is still a narrow personal sentiment—but the first outgrowth from the utter selfishness of the preceding relation. This phase grew up with the growth of the ancient civilizations, which never passed beyond it. The highly sensual and personal basis of their love sentiment is shown in the wide-spread worship of Venus and the related deities, who, under various names, possessed similar attributes.

At length, in the ripeness of time, love assumed a third phase, which we may call the spiritual, and became an impersonal sentiment, embracing not one person or one tribe, but all mankind. This phase was not of rapid growth. It yet exists in but an imperfect state, reaching a high grade of development only in the minds of the most highly cultured. We may class it as the ultimate outgrowth of the love principle, the grand idea of universal human brotherhood. It first began to take the hearts of the nations captive in the Middle Ages, giving rise, in its first imperfect stage, to the curious customs and sentiments of chivalry. It has, in our day, greatly advanced beyond this incipient stage. To the ancient Greeks and their contemporaries the world beyond their national limits was peopled by foes and barbarians, with whom no idea of faith or justice needed to be considered.

The sole notion of fraternity consisted in allegiance to the race and tribe. Even this was so narrow in Greece that the Hellenes broke up into a multitude of small communities, perpetually jarring with each other. In Rome the modern spirit began to grow, and the great city first conquered and then made citizens of all the civilized and half the savage nations. But the sentiment of fraternity was, even with them, but in its germ, and the cosmopolitan philanthropy of our days would have found no echo in the soul of a Greek or a Roman. Asia, though more barbarous, was, in this respect, in advance of her cultured Hellenic foe. In the writings of her great law-givers we find sentiments which fell blank upon the world, and which even we but faintly appreciate in our actions.

The life of Christ stands as the dividing line between the ancient and modern worlds. With His birth antiquity ended and the long reign of the present began. We give not this as a blank chronological idea, but as a theory based in the nature and development of the human mind, instead of in the superficial movement of history. He first enunciated to a world ready to profit by His words the grand idea of universal brotherhood, a fraternity not alone of the inhabitants of earth but of all the living souls in God's universe.

The Roman world, in which we have seen the gradual growth of a phase of mentality within and beyond that animating the Greeks, was ripe to receive these new teachings. The seeds of Christ's moral apothegms fell in fertile soil. They have ever since been growing into a most glorious harvest. They bore their first fruit in the chivalrous sentiment of the Middle Ages. The world is still slowly rising to their level, and assimilating itself to their full depth of meaning, to be only finally reached—

> " When the war-drums throb no longer and the battle-flags are furled,
> In the parliament of man, the federation of the world."*

We are thus fully justified in drawing this new dividing line between the great eras of human development. In Grecian culture we have a culmination of the earlier phases of mentality. It is the finishing epoch of a grand era, that in which the sentiment of appreciation of the physical and devotion to the personal attained its highest limit. The result was the most striking and meritorious that the human race has yet produced, for it is the only finished product of the human mind. Christ, as we have said, enunciated the governing principles of a new era, that in which we still are, and which is, as yet, far from its culmination.

But to attain the fullest conception of the artistic energies of the two periods we must consider their literature, and chiefly their poetry, for in the songs of a race are its inmost soul and impelling sentiment most fully displayed.

In Greek poetry we have every phase of the Hellenic mind set in the most splendid frames of verse. In Grecian literature not only the characteristics of the Hellenic mentality are displayed, but those of the great previous civilizations from whose labors Greece derived her impetus, and the spirit of whose lost books she has preserved for us.† The striking difference between the impelling force of ancient and modern poetry is easily recognizable. The muse of Greece walked upon the earth; or, if she took wing, her flight was to and from the peak of high Olympus, where dwelt the gods of heaven. Her thoughts entered not that land of mist and marvel in which so many mortals habitually dwell.

The taste for poetry has changed with the change in its spirit. We now admire Homer only as we admire the Parthenon, for the harmony of his outlines, and the grace and grandeur of his effects. His work is perfect, as the whole Greek civilization was perfect, but it is a lower grade of perfection than that to which we are growing, and fails to arouse the inmost faculties of our minds.

---

* Tennyson's *Locksley Hall.*

† " On peut considérer les Grecs, relativement à la littérature, comme le premier peuple qui ait existé."—De Stael, *Littérature*, vol. 1, p. 75.

Even modern epochs are losing ground with modern readers to the extent that they bind themselves to the forms, and are infiltrated with the spirit of the ancients. The modern world is developing its informing spirit even beyond the level of Chaucer, Milton, Spenser and Dante, and is beginning to read these authors from a sense of duty, not *con amore.* It is not that our intellects are deteriorating, and that we lack the mental grasp of our ancestors, but that the day of the epic is past, or that olden poetry lacks an element which appeals to the human soul in the strophes of the modern bard.

Shakespeare and his contemporaries were the first to break utterly loose from Hellenic fetters, and to launch upon the sea of new developed thought their poetic barks. Infused with the spirit of the modern world, free from that influence of the antique which overshadows the epic, they produced works the true exponent of the new world of thought, as grand and as original as the Gothic cathedral.

Homer, the accepted expression of the loftiest poetic ideal of the past, looks at life everywhere from the physical standpoint. In his verse no purely ideal conception enters. His limning is not of the souls of men, but of their brains and bodies; not of the spiritual significance, but of the apparent visage of nature. He truly sings the anger of Achilles and the fall of Troy. His page is animate with angry words and deadly blows. Heroes fall like mown hay. Hector, that spirit nearest approaching the ideal of Bayard of which the past was capable, sinks before the might of invulnerable Achilles. The gods enter the conflict, and are wounded by the iron and ashen weapons of men.

It is throughout the apotheosis of the physical. Homer's merit is the merit of the sculptors and architects of his country—grace, harmony, and physical perfection. The smooth and stately flow of his verse, its rich variety of conception, its correct imagery, its skilfully varied circumstance and its pure and lofty diction alone render the Iliad endurable to modern readers.

Nowhere does it contain the informing spirit of modern verse. His imagery, that feature of poetry in which the vim of the style most fully resides, is wholly borrowed from visible nature, and is limited to the most apparent of her infinite similitudes. Storm and calm, the labors of the husbandman, the assaults of wild animals, the busy labors of the insect world, the rising and setting of the sun, all the prominent evolutions of nature are applied with an appositeness which shows with what a poetic eye the great bard of antiquity looked upon the world surrounding. Nowhere in his pages do we find a just application of Shakespeare's picture of the poet:

> "The poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,
> Does glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven;
> And, as imagination bodies forth
> The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
> Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothings
> A local habitation and a name."

Airy nothing has no local habitation on the pages of the Greek bard. His very deities are things of the most substantial character. Homer says: "The Greek army was on the field as thick as flowers in spring." Is not this, to our modern taste, a singular lack of appreciation of the interior sentiment of flowers? Dante would never have dreamed of numbering soldiers by flowers. The Greeks saw in nature only her usefulness. It is her beauty and spiritual significance which appeals to us.

Shakespeare's description applies but to the modern poet. The verses of our bards are so instinct with these bodiless imaginings, that to take the fire of super-physical thought from them would be to leave but barren prose. Many of our singers are yet of the earth, earthy, yet it may justly be claimed that the distinctive spirit of modern poetry is this power to open the doors leading into the unseen, and let fall upon the entranced world bright rays of the light within—"The light that never was on sea or land." Far out at sea our poets sail, the shores of the material sink below their horizon, while, like floating islands in their course, rise the realms of the purely ideal. Free from space, time, and all gross circumstance, they onward float—

"With thoughts like ships that cannot land,
Blown by faint winds about a magic coast."*

In the words of Ruskin, who most clearly among writers of art has perceived the essential difference in spirit between ancient and modern times, "Keates describes a wave breaking at sea:

'Down whose green back the short-lived foam, all hoar,
Burst gradual, with a wayward indolence.'

Homer could not have written nor thought of such words. The wave would have been to him, from beginning to end, but salt water. He will call the waves over-roofed, full-charged, compact-black, deep-clear, wine-colored. But these but describe mere physical nature. Everything which nods at the brow—rock, house, or wave—is with him over-roofed. Accurate as his words are they never show feeling of anything animated in the ocean. It is always cold salt water only."

The same spirit animated all the poets of Greece. Everywhere they excelled in description of the manifest attributes of man and nature; everywhere the fierce vigor of human passions, the wild display of human licentiousness burn on their pages. Nowhere do they express the inner sentiment of the fields and flowers, the spiritual dignity of man, the deep affinities which link all nature into one grand unity, or man's aspiring reach towards the infinite unseen. We may illustrate by some passages taken at random from Greek and modern writers. We will select translations of verses showing their highest ideal of the living force of nature and the feelings with which death infused their minds. From Bion's beautiful "Elegy on Adonis" we extract the following verse:

"'Ah, Venus! ah! the Loves for thee bewail;
With that lost youth thy fading graces fail.
Her beauty bloomed while life was in his eyes;
Ah, woe! with him it bloomed, with him it dies.

---

* *Owen Meredith*, vol. 1.

The woods and mountains 'Ah, Adonis!' sigh,
The rivers moan to Venus' agony,
The mountain springs all trickle into tears,
The blush of grief on every flower appears;
And Venus o'er each solitary hill,
And through wide cities chants her dirges shrill." *

Here woods and mountains, streams and flowers are beautifully invested with sympathy in the wild grief of the goddess for her lost lover, but there is no trace of individuality in their action, no personal attribute distinguishing any one component element of nature from the others. They, like the Dryads and Fauns which personate them, are bodies without souls, physically analogous to man, devoid of super-sensual attributes. We will further extract from the "Monody on the death of Bion," by his friend Moschus, a poem as full of feeling and imagery as any which antiquity has left us.

"Ye woods, with grief your waving summits bow;
Ye Dorian fountains, murmur as ye flow;
From weeping urns your copious sorrows shed,
And bid the rivers mourn for Bion dead.
Ye shady groves, in robes of sable hue
Bewail; ye plants, in pearly drops of dew;
Ye drooping flowers, diffuse a languid breath,
And die with sorrow at sweet Bion's death;
Ye roses, change from red to sickly pale,
And all ye bright anemones bewail."†

And so he continues with pages of such sweet singing, yet never rises above the direct aspects of nature. He nowhere descends and grasps the personality, the individual sentiment of any feature of nature. The waters, the hills, the groves, the flowers, are taken in mass, or only individualized by the visible feature of color; and, as in the preceding instance, their only evidence of life is to weep, to moan and to turn pale.

If we turn now to modern verse, a new spirit is speedily manifest. The parts of nature are individualized, each has its distinct mode of feeling, its personal attributes, its special sentiment and character in the intricate drama of life. We

---

* Mill's *Greek Poets*, page 215.

† *Greek Poets*, p. 220.

will extract an elegiac verse from Milton, a poet not wholly broken loose from the pagan sentiment of his classic models, whose cosmogony is half mythological, but who in his shorter poems is instinct with a sentiment alien to the Greek.

> "Bring the rath primrose that, forsaken, dies,
> The tufted crowtoe and pale jessamine,
> The white pink and the pansy freaked with jet,
> The glowing violet,
> The musk rose and the well-attired woodbine,
> With cowslips wan that hang the pensive head,
> And every flower that sad embroidery wears;
> Bid amaranthus all his beauty shed,
> Bid daffodillies fill their cups with tears
> To strew the laureat herse where Lycid lies." *

There is no casting the eyes at random over nature, catching at a glance the physical features of the fields, streams, and mountains, and describing only these salient analogies to humanity. Nor is it a scientific investigation of the particular features of nature, but rather the loving research of poetic eyes, and the instinctive grasp by the poetic mind of the innate features that give personality to every flower of the fields. In all Greek literature we will not find a line analogous in spirit to "the rath primrose that, forsaken, dies." Their poets never enter into this close communion with the members of nature's great family. They would see nothing in the primrose beyond its color and the shape of its leaves.

Descending to more modern times we will extract from the fine elegy of Shelly on the death of Keats, a poem, in its whole, utterly alien to the spirit of Hellenic verse, and which no Greek bard could either have written or have comprehended. We will take here, as in the preceding instances, an apostrophe to nature:

> "He lives! he wakes!—'tis Death is dead, not he!
> Mourn not for Adonais. Thou, young dawn,
> Turn all thy dew to splendor, for from thee
> The spirit thou lamentest is not gone;
> Ye caverns and ye forests, cease to mourn!
> Cease, ye faint flowers and fountains! and thou, air,
> Which like a mourning veil thy scarf hadst thrown
> O'er the abandoned earth, now leave it bare
> Even to the joyous stars which smile on its despair!"†

---

* Milton's *Lycidas*.

† Shelly's *Adonais*, v., 41.

The invocation here is not to grieve, but to cease mourning, for in his passing away death has been conquered, and a higher life, the disembodied existence of the soul, has succeeded the gross imperfection and animality of the earthly life. In these verses burns a spirit of aspiring thought, of extra-mundane idea, which widely informs modern poetry, but fails to illumine the pages of the ancient bards. The war-songs of Homer, the wine-songs of Anacreon, the love-songs of Sappho, the Idylliums of Bion and Moschus, the dramas of Sophocles and Æschylus are alike built on a sensuous plane. They show us nothing of the spirit instinct in the flesh, of the soul that burns through the sense. To them the world is a mighty appearance, the universe a vast exterior. The poetic remains of Greece appear like the ruins of its sculpture—

> "Strange fragments
> Of forms once held divine, and still, like angels,
> Immortal everywhere.".*

But the modern poet has ceased to regard form as the all-essential ingredient of art. The spirit of modern poetry is like the genius of the Arabian fisherman escaping from the open casket of verse in gliding mist from the eyes of its uncultured possessor, but to eyes of deeper vision gathering into majestic and sublime figures, all whose strength and beauty no eye can fathom.

We will conclude with a consideration of that phase of human thought in which its mental status is most plainly realized—the conception of Deity. Nowhere does a nation reach so deeply into the kingdom of the unknown as in its search for a God; and truly, in comparing national powers of abstract thought, "By their *gods* ye shall know them." This consideration, in the Christian world, lifts us out of the realm of art. The hand of no artist has a reach capable of grasping the least attribute of the Deity. The finite can nowhere embrace the infinite, and every effort to render the Godhead conceivable, as in Paradise Lost, must end in utter failure.

But the Grecian deity was fully within the reach of art, and forms the highest subject to which their art has applied itself. For even in this phase the thought of Greece was based upon the physical plane. We speak not now of the conceptions of her few mighty men of thought who had broken loose from the bondage of mythology and projected their ideas far beyond the common grasp, but of the people taken as a whole.

---

* *Sidney Dobell's Poems.*

Of the multitudinous divinities, celestial, terrestrial, and infernal, with which this form-loving race peopled the universe —and truly they were liberal enough in their distribution— not one stood above man's possibilities in nature or character. They were but invisible men and women, with all our virtues and all our faults, and gravitated so heavily to earth that only the firm plateau of a mountain summit was able to support the mighty burden of their celestial court.

Zeus, the king of Heaven, and their loftiest conception of Deity, passed life like some sensual eastern monarch. Yet, whatever their few minds of deep insight may have conceived of a superior Deity, it was this being that the race, as a whole, worshipped—the loftiest figure in their pantheon, the controller by brute force of the turbulent family that loved and squabbled upon Olympus.*

Indeed, in some of his adventures, he may seem to stand at a lower level than any but men of debased minds, but such adventures were both credible and creditable in the Greek cities, and Grecian society, in its sexual relations, stood at a level which would appear quite abominable to modern minds. Crimes to which we prefer to give no name were looked upon as venial faults of their great men.

The same facts hold good of all ancient mythologies; the adventures of their gods simply varying to suit the mental character of the people. Thus the love-tales of the Greek deities are replaced by combat and cunning in the Scandinavian myths. The most metaphysical conceptions of the early creed-makers speedily degenerated into similar anthropomorphic deities, and men built their gods out of the revealments of their senses. The ancient Hebrews are no exception to the rule. Whatever view their seers and prophets may have taken of the Deity, to the people at large he continued physically in their own image.

---

* "The Greek could not conceive a spirit. He could do nothing without limbs. His god is a finite being, a being of clay, strength and human passions."—Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, p. 3, sec. ii., chap. V, § 20.

Christ first gave the world a juster image of the Almighty. The God of the New Testament is a Being vitally distinct from the deific revelation of any preceding religious work. But throughout the Middle Ages He continued to be worshipped under an anthropomorphic image, and is so to the great majority of the Christian world to this day. Only to the developed minds of the modern world has God left his kingdom of the concrete and retired into that depth of immutable abstraction which no human conception can enter, though men forever strain with throbbing souls to gain a glimpse of visible Deity in the universe.

Minds of the deepest critical acumen and of marvellous insight have searched the realm of the metaphysical, and have attained a depth of logical departure from the visible to which few can follow them. Yet, far beyond their utmost reach lies the divine mystery which they seek to unfold. The world moves on, reaching, craving, praying, but not attaining.

ART. VIII. — *Sketches of the Life and Labors of Horace Greeley.* By the Daily Press.

It is seldom that the public expressions of grief which follow the demise of a distinguished character are a true exponent of the degree and quality of the feeling which his loss excites. We behold our great men from a distance; to most of us they are merely the idols of the day, filling an exalted position, and attended by a parade of circumstance, rather than fully apprehended personalities—natures with whom our own has come into contact. We can hardly be said to feel the loss of one, however high his position, between whom and us there has been no reciprocation of feeling. We may, indeed, in a certain sense, regret his departure, merely because we have become used to his filling an important place in the social machinery; but this is not the same kind of feeling as that which we experience on the death of a personal friend, one who has shared with us, in greater or less degree, his own and our life. To our affections, at least, great men are impersonalities. They die, and the world moves on. We, the remaining actors, carry forward the play, and, as part of it, surround their obsequies with more or less of pomp and pageantry. We dismiss them, and reserve our real fund of feeling for occasions that are personal to ourselves.

But these remarks, while true in general, must be taken with some qualification as applied to particular instances. There are men who, though rarely or never brought into direct contact with us, have yet the power, through the magnetism of their written words, or by virtue of a peculiar individuality, to obtain a personal hold upon us. The influence they exert is recognized as one of the habitual influences governing our lives.

Among men of this stamp we must place the great journalist whom the nation laments. Horace Greeley, more perhaps than any other man of our time, had impressed himself upon the heart of the people. He was a fireside guest; not one whom we receive hospitably and dismiss with a "God-speed," but one for whom a place is always kept in reserve. In innumerable wayside farm-houses he became one of the home influences, and now in each of these a chair is vacant: the loss is a personal one.

It is universally admitted—by his opponents as fully as by his followers—that, as a journalist, Mr. Greeley exercised a greater personal power than any man of our day. And as among those forces which are direct in their effect upon social movements, newspaper journalism is the predominating one of the age, this is to ascribe to Mr. Greeley, not necessarily the highest place as a representative man, but the highest as a direct social influence.

But in our appreciation of the distinguished merits of Mr. Greeley, and our grief for his death, we should not be unjust to others who are also dead. It were unjust to forget so soon that there have been other great editors of our daily journals; it is no depreciation of Mr. Greeley to admit that Mr. Bennett was not only more distinctively an editor than he, but did vastly more for journalism. The latter had no higher ambition than that of being a great editor. He wished to occupy no more exalted position. Accordingly he may be said to have lived and died an editor; and by editors and editors only, not by politicians, did he wish to be carried to his grave, without pomp or pageantry. No editor had more enemies in his time than Mr. Bennett; no one was more misrepresented or more abused; because no editor was more independent or more fearless in the expression of his opinions. But finally, when his work was done, his most inveterate foes were among the first to acknowledge that he had attained complete success, and occupied the foremost place among American journalists.

Poor Mr. Raymond died too soon to have justice done him. Much as he had accomplished, he may be said to have fallen just as he had commenced a most brilliant career. Mr. Raymond, also, differed from Mr. Bennett in his aspirations, so far as to wish political preferment. But he regarded the highest office he ever sought as subordinate to his position and duties as an editor. The best proof of this is to be found in the incredible amount of editorial labor he performed while senator, speaker and lieutenant-governor, for some of the best editorials he ever wrote were written at Albany and Washington, whereas at no time, for no office, would he have consented to lay aside the editorial pen. These are no new views on the part of the writer of these remarks as to the relative merits of Bennett, Raymond and Greeley, as editors. They are the views which we entertained and expressed while each of the three great rivals lived and toiled. It would ill become us now, therefore, when the three are dead, to speak of the last as if American journalism could claim him alone as an editor of the first class. These distinctions—disparaging to none, but fair, we trust, to all—being clearly understood, we proceed, as will be seen, in a spirit the reverse of one of fault-finding. All we ask is that no remark we make appreciative of Mr. Greeley's qualities of head or heart will be regarded as in any manner depreciative of those of his distinguished rivals, whose graves are as silent and sacred as his.

The secret of Mr. Greeley's power as a journalist lay, not in the orginality of his conceptions—for though a strong, he was not a deep, thinker—but in the originality, that is, the purity, the freshness, the strength, the unsimulated quality of his moral nature. He was not one of the numerous shams that are paraded in public. One may say of him that morally he never left the granite of his native hills, and that, however wavering and uncertain his physical gait, his moral nature was firmly planted upon the underlying rock. Add to this, in estimating the sources of his power, his singular frankness. He wore no disguises. Most writers are ashamed of their best thoughts, and think it necessary to array their minds, as well as their bodies, in the fashion of the hour. Mr. Greeley opened his heart to all men. Accordingly the fools, the fashion-mongers, and the cynics laughed at him; knaves preyed upon him, but the true-hearted, particularly the sturdy farmers, whose thoughts, if the less facile and various, are the more genuine, were strongly drawn to this transparent, confiding nature.

It was not, then, merely the New York Tribune as an organized power, which, in those earlier days, received so friendly a welcome in our rural homes, but the frank, outspoken editor-in-chief. The Tribune—if the expression may be allowed—was but the great white coat, full of pockets that were always bulging out with good things—the latest news, the newest speculations, the freshest thoughts, and plenty of agricultural tid-bits. The coat was treated with respect and its pockets duly rifled; but above all it was the great warm heart that it enfolded, and whose pulsations were felt through it, that inspired the welcome.

We have said that the prime source of Mr. Greeley's great influence as a journalist lay in the purity, freshness and strength—we may add breadth—of his moral nature. From the earliest days of his journalism, the honesty of "Uncle Horace" was current as a proverb, even in the mouths of his adversaries, and of those who laughed at him for his eccentricities and crotchets. But qualities of the heart such as these, while they go far of themselves in private life, avail but little in the world at large, if they are not reinforced by the power of intellect. They impel the shaft and drive it home, but the shaft must get its effective shape and its barb from the intellect; it must be fitly forged for the intended aim. And it may well be said of Mr. Greeley's brain, that it was a workshop in which, beneath the brawny blows of the master, making the sparks fly, good, strong implements were wrought—crowbars and sledge-hammers, mighty for the overturning of ancient wrong, or ploughshares useful for turning up the soil for future and better growths. But he was the smith who forges the share, not himself the sower of the seed. There are men—rare as angels' visits—whose brains are not workshops, but laboratories of a finer chemistry, secreting that divine seed of thought, which, scattered along the waysides of the world, springs up to a glorious fruition in the future. The inferior but necessary task for which the qualities of Mr. Greeley's head and heart especially fitted him, was to prepare the way, to remove useless incumbrances, to burn off the stubble, to plough up the soil.

What distinguished him above many other workers of the same class was the strength, the handiness, the special aptness of the implements he welded; they came hot from his anvil and singed when they fell. They were not without a certain beauty—smooth, when smoothness was needful, rough, when roughness served a purpose—a kind of beauty which always accompanies a thing well constructed for use. Such was their quality; but what gave them great superadded power was the conviction which soon got abroad among the purchasers, that from this workshop one might be sure of getting *honest* work, and many men who were constitutionally opposed to whatover is new-fangled, learned to respect and finally to accept the proffered wares.

It would not, however, be just to Mr. Greeley to say that his intellect was only capable of coarse work—though coarseness, in any sense, is hardly the fair word to apply to the average product of his brain. Mr. Greeley had a side open to those finer intuitions, which are the special heritage of the highest order of minds, and which, though efficient re-agents in personal culture, are comparatively powerless in the work of practical reform. By drawing off the attention to underlying causes, by making us to see how much the inherent, organizing forces of society are doing, and how trifling in comparison are our individual efforts, their tendency is to dispose us to fall back into an attitude of studious contemplation, and to await in patience nature's predestined solution of social problems. Happily, these intuitions are habitual to few, or society would be left without those direct agents of that organic development which the seers see. But the practical reformer who shall achieve the most efficient service in his day must have a susceptibility and a craving for those higher intuitions, else the man becomes wholly lost in his work, and one-half his strength is shorn from him. That Mr. Greeley possessed a susceptibility of this kind, Margaret Fuller bears testimony—a lady preëminently gifted with the vision to discern those finer qualities of character which others may feel, but cannot define. "Sweetness and light"—these are the qualities which culture demands by the voice of Matthew Arnold, its prophet. And sweetness and light, if the features and expression of the face are an index of the habit of the soul, certainly were not lacking in Mr. Greeley—the sweetness which flows from breadth of sympathy and trustful faith, and the light of a vision that looks beyond the present. But the whole course of Mr. Greeley's life, its earlier struggles, its imperative call for the exertion of personal will, as well as the overriding influences and needs of the times, brought out the practical bent of his nature; to this tendency, also, his strong desire to do good, to remove immediate, pressing evils from the pathway of men, lent additional force.

That a more regular, comprehensive education would have had much effect in modifying the temper and tendency of Mr. Greeley's mind, is doubtful. Men of strong nature, of decided bent, make the educational influences that come in their way subserve their own uses; like powerful streams, they are not easily diverted from their course, but merely take up and carry along with them the interposing material. It is possible that a more methodic education would have made Mr. Greeley's a more homogeneous character; it might have tempered the impetuosity and passion of the moment by an infusion of the underlying sweetness of his nature; it might, in the light of organic law, have lessened his dependence upon social machinery, and therewith prevented his fluctuating so easily between the extremes of hope and despondency, of faith and distrust. But whether what he gained as a man he would not have lost as a journalist; whether he would have thrown himself so ardently into the work of reform, and dealt existing evils equally effective blows, is doubtful. The age needed him such as he was, and the age made him thus.

In Mr. Greeley's nature there was a strong conservative element—a statement which, in view of his vigorous protests against organized social wrongs, and the liberal welcome he gave to new projects and speculations, may seem paradoxical. But if Mr. Greeley was not, in the conventional sense, *a* conservative, he was, as is always the case with the highest class of reformers, conservative at heart. Never, even in the earlier days of his journalism, was he a destructive reformer—one who seeks to substitute, for the organic results of social progress, the mechanical arrangements which an abstract sense of justice may dictate, though this was the aspect in which the exigencies of the times and the necessities of journalism tended to represent him. The truest conservatism is not that which clings to existing social forms merely because they are sanctioned by time, but that which recognizes a force of organic growth in society, conserving the old as nature's envelopment of the slowly forming new. To this sense of the inherent vitality of society, Mr. Greeley had an open side, though it had not in him that creative force which belongs to genius, and only served as a controlling, repressive element. He was not incapable of tracing old wrongs to their root in what is good and true. He was no friend of abrupt, violent changes; he believed in compromises and compensations. He did not confound the unfortunate inheritors and exponents of organized evils with the evils themselves, like those narrower minds who dispense to the former, only a little more liberally, the hate which is due to the latter, and who, amid the little cloud of dust they raise around themselves, lose sight of the serene heaven which has so long tolerated the evils they attack.

Was Mr. Greeley a consistent man? The charge of inconsistency has been often brought against him, and no estimate of his character and life would be complete without a reference to it. The charge is one to which great minds are most exposed. The narrow-minded are very easily consistent; their thoughts describe an orbit—if orbit it may be called—which is fixed and unchangeable; and to such, and from their point of view, the planetary wanderings of the greater spirits are full of recessions and obliquities. But no general accusation of this kind can be properly met without a preliminary discrimination of what is implied in it. There is an intellectual consistency which demands, on the one hand, a present coherence in the body of one's thought, and, on the other, that new and strange opinions shall not be arbitrarily adopted, but shall be the genuine outgrowth of past thought. There is also a moral consistency, which prescribes that one shall have a distinct aim in life, a definite motive of action, and shall remain true to it. And there is consistency of external conduct, which flows from the selection of the right means and methods, the right course of action, for the accomplishment of the proposed ends. Of an infringement of the latter kind of consistency, we think Mr. Greeley justly chargeable, as we shall show when we come to refer more particularly to his life; but, in the light of what we have said concerning the intrinsic elements of his character, we do not hesitate to bring him forward as a conspicuous illustration of true moral and intellectual consistency.

He had but one great aim—to promote by voice and pen the greatest good of the greatest number, and whatever political or social scheme seemed calculated to this end, into the advocacy of that he threw himself with all the ardor of his soul. But the conservative force of his nature restrained him from attaching all the importance to special schemes which their advocates claimed for them, who, of course, charged him with fickleness and inconsistency. From socialism he adopted the coöperative feature, nor did he ever cease to urge its advantages as occasion required. He was among the earliest advocates of a larger sphere of activity for woman, of her equal social rights before the law, and her claim to all the educational advantages open to the other sex; and in this position he stood fast. If other champions of woman have advanced to the claim of political equality, they may, from their point of view, blame him for backwardness, but they may not accuse him of unsteadfastness.

American slavery, in the days of its power, had no heartier hater than Horace Greeley, no more formidable foe; but yet when at last it lay crushed with the rebellion which it caused, there was no inconsistency in his advocacy of a general amnesty toward its old supporters. A weakness you may call it, in which the heart got the better of the head, or a wise foresight, in which the head affirmed the best impulses of the heart, but an inconsistency you may not call it. The proposition was consistent with the whole spirit and tenor of Horace Greeley's life; a good mathematician who had studied the parabola of Mr. Greeley's mental process might have predicted it. And here we are reminded of that characteristic letter, which must ever remain a conspicuous jewel in the life of this man:

> "MY FRIEND:—Of course I threw away the senatorship in 1866—knowing well that I did so—and I did myself great pecuniary harm in 1867 by bailing Jeff. Davis; but suppose I hadn't done either?
>
> "Either God rules this world, or does not. I believe he does.
>
> "Yours, HORACE GREELEY."

The weakness of Mr. Greeley's character flowed, in part, out of the best part of his nature; in part, they were a reaction from the circumstances of his life. Full of broad human sympathy, he had an inordinate craving for appreciation, and was not inaccessible to flattery. Open and confiding himself, he was easily imposed upon by the pretending confidences of others. Thorough-going in his advocacy of what seemed to him right and good, clear and strong in his convictions, he was impatient of contradiction or dissent, quick to suspect the honesty and good faith of his opponents, and apt, therefore, to be betrayed into unseemly intemperances of speech, though, to his honor be it said, these ebullitions of the moment were forgotten with the occasion that called them forth. He held no parley, however, with undoubted dishonesty and shame, and called things by their right names. Mr. Greeley's success in life, achieved, as it was, from such unpromising beginnings, and *that* by his own unaided efforts, led him often into a momentary over-estimate of his influence and claims, and into a dogmatic pride of opinion, which contrasted strangely with his child-like docility and gentleness of heart. It was in this quarter, if anywhere, that his character was not thoroughly compact, homogeneous, consistent.

In this review of Horace Greeley as a man, we have not thought it necessary to interweave, however slightly, the incidents of his career. The story of his life was already well known to the general public, and now the leading journals of the day have made it familiar to the world. The picture of the Vermont boy, stretched upon the floor of his father's cabin, reading by the light of the fire; the picture of the awkward 'prentice lad stooping over his "case" in a dingy New York printing office, while the busy thoughts in that large brain are setting up matter for future articles; the picture of the great editor dealing forth his vehement fulminations against the constituted powers of evil, and making his vigorous appeals to the moral sense of the people; the picture of the genial old man whose face, full of "sweetness and light," is bent over a copy of the journal in which the heart, the thought, the work of his life are embodied; and finally the picture of the defeated candidate, led from the grave of his dead wife, himself doomed to a swift-following death: these are pictures which will long hold their place in the American heart, and become the theme of many a lesson to the school-boy of the future.

It was a great mistake, the one inconsistency in Mr. Greeley's career, his allowing himself to be diverted from his function as journalist, for which he was preëminently fitted both by nature and the education of circumstances. Journalism has become a distinct and most important force in the social economy of the age. It has its special duties and its special honors, and he, who thinks to make it only a stepping-stone to political preferment, does not comprehend its duties, and is not worthy of its honors. We do not, however, for a moment accuse Mr. Greeley of thus debasing his high calling. Although it must be admitted that Mr. Greeley was ambitious of political distinction, that his personal pride craved this as the final recognition of the great services he had rendered his party and the country, still we believe that his desire for office was chiefly instigated by his best aspirations, his wish to do good, to carry out beneficent reforms. To which must be added, as an additional motive, the strong self-reliance of the man, his confidence that he could do best himself that which he saw needed the doing. Thus his weaknesses and his best impulses contributed to lead him astray from his chosen path, and his death, regarded as a result of this error, presents accordingly some of the highest elements of dramatic interest. Behold, a noble spirit, misled by his own generous impulses, yielding to pardonable weaknesses, departs, in the fulness of undiminished powers, from his fore-ordained work, and spends himself in a vain contest with destiny.

Mr. Greeley's candidacy, notwithstanding his personal popularity, was essentially a weak one. The people are to a great extent under the despotic sway of their imaginations; they are image-worshippers. When they have formed a distinct image of a man as connected with certain functions, or a definite position in the social economy, they do not like to have that image disturbed; we find it difficult to conceive him in any other capacity, and are disposed to resent or ridicule the proposition to do so. If a man has become distinguished as senator and has served long as such, the images of the man and the senator become permanently conjoined, and we find it easier to associate the idea of president with some comparatively unknown man, whose personality is as yet a hazy and undefined quantity. Hence, in considerable degree, the ill-success of a Clay and a Webster, hence the success of a Polk, and—we may happily add—a Lincoln. But this tyrannous sway of the imagination ruled still more forcibly in the case of Mr. Greeley. For forty years he had been prominent in our thoughts as a great editor, a Warwick who makes and unmakes presidents, but may not himself become one. It was this, more than anything in the man himself, which was the secret of that surprise with which the country awoke to the announcement of his candidacy. Then, too, here was the pioneer of "republicanism" become the accepted chief of the "democracy!" A new violence to our preconceived images, our superficial appreciation of the fitness of things! Against the weight of apparent anomalies such as these, the most transcendent qualities of head and heart, the greatest personal popularity, could oppose but a weak resistance. The only wonder is that under the circumstances, with our human nature thus stolid as it is, Mr. Greeley did so well. But the wonder will be found greater if it be remembered that so long as the most ignorant classes have the same power in making a choice at an election as the most intelligent classes, so long must we expect to see intellectual mediocrity, or even imbecility and ignorance triumph over intellectual greatness, knowledge, and statesmanship, since, let us do what we may for education, the ignorant and thoughtless must ever be in the majority.

Accordingly, as the campaign progressed, Mr. Greeley's sympathetic nature must have felt keenly, not so much the calumnies of an unscrupulous partizanship, but the apparent undermining, in a few brief months, of that firm foundation of good-will which he had laid for himself in the hearts of the people. On the one hand, he saw the enfranchised slaves, for whom no one had done more than he, turned against him by the arts of demagogues; on the other hand, he saw the sturdy farmers of the North and West, so many of whom were wont to look to him for counsel and guidance, estranged from him, misunderstanding him, losing their faith in him, reducing him in conception to the level of a demagogue who, for the gratification of political leadership, turns his back upon his whole life! It was this feeling, much more than to further his own success, that prompted him to that remarkable trip to the West, in the course of which he delivered that rapid succession of off-hand speeches, which, whatever their effect upon the campaign, certainly did much to restore to Mr. Greeley his hold upon the popular heart. They are the last words of Horace Greeley to the American people, and none of his admirers could wish for him a fitter summing up of the aims and motives of his life than the noble monitions of forgiveness and reconciliation with which he has thus shrouded his decadence.

Though Mr. Greeley failed as a political candidate, and though he greatly erred in permitting himself ever to be diverted from his true field of labor, his life was nevertheless a noble success. A pioneer in the enfranchisement of the slave, the friend of every humanitarian project, the prophet of amnesty and reconciliation, the founder of the New York Tribune—that was enough. If he did not succeed at last in bringing his party as rapidly as he wished to his own high standard, what he lacked of accomplishment living, his influence, made more impressive by his death, will go far to consummate.

Only the meanest or the hardest soul could fail to be touched by so tragic a close of a career like his. Allowing full effect to physical causes, the excitements of the campaign, the exhaustive journeys, the night vigils by the side of a dying wife, the general overstraining of the nervous forces—it may still be truly said that Horace Greeley died of a broken heart. Here was a man who had, for a generation, been addressing himself to the heart of the people, had sought to inspire them with his own impulses for the right, had made them feel the warmth of his own nature, had built for himself, as he trusted, an imperishable monument in their esteem and sympathy, had grown accustomed to the assured recognition of his work. But, at last, in the wane of life, and at an hour when, leaving in the grave the remains of his dead wife, he more than ever needs the accustomed sympathy and support, it seems for the moment to be taken away from him. What wonder if at such a time he should feel that the defeat of the political candidate was the defeat of the editor, the thinker, the man? What wonder if the heart, so generous of love, so dependent upon the recognition of others, should think itself abandoned, betrayed? This source of life, this vital essence of the man being sapped, the physical power, naturally strong, at last gives way, and, "it is done;" a noble and eminently useful life goes out.

NOTICES AND CRITICISMS.

EDUCATION.

Cornell's Series of School Geographies. New and Revised Edition.
By S. S. Cornell. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

Although we devoted, some time since, a small space to an examination of these books, in which we pointed out some of their more prominent defects, yet we feel it our duty to notice them again, in view of the fact that, having been lately "revised," they are now claimed to be, like another series of the same publishers, "absolutely perfect text-books, with no defects," "The best series of school geographies extant," etc. Extraordinary means are employed to introduce them into all our schools, and very questionable inducements are held out to teachers and others in order to accomplish this purpose. It is unnecessary to say that we do not again revert to the subject from any other motive than the desire to deal justly and impartially with all classes of publications, and that we should equally fail in our vocation as reviewers and in our duty to the public and the rising generation were we to refrain from criticising works of this pretentious kind, which are at present flooding our schools.

In no class of books are the sales so great or the profits so large as in school books. Once introduced into a school, a ready market is found for hundreds or thousands of copies annually, which, when destroyed, are replaced by new ones, while other works find only individual purchasers, who need but one copy.

That this is immensely profitable is amply illustrated by the new firms rapidly springing up in all parts of the country, and the fierce competition existing between rival houses. But recently a division has been made of the several States and parts of States between the leading publishers, and the wolves having temporarily ceased to rend each other, now turn in harmony to devour the lambs! The effect of such a course upon the schools is obvious. A firm thus having an opportunity to supply a section of country without competition. throw in all their publications, of whatever character, at rapidly increasing rates, until a rich harvest is reaped before they are compelled to abandon the field to a new party, who repeat the extortion.

This "massacre of the innocents" is going on around us unheeded and unchecked, either because the American people are too much occupied to attend to the wants of their children, or because they are the best-natured and most easily imposed upon of any people on earth. They are not lacking in love for their children. They send them to the most expensive schools and pay the bills cheerfully, but what parent ever inquires into the character of the text-books used, or examines them himself? Hence it becomes the more necessary that they should be informed of the manner in which they are relieved of their money for what is often worse than useless, and the mind of the pupil, by the rapid changes, is reduced to a state of comparative chaos, in which if any light and order remain, they are not the result of the present system of supplying him with text-books. How to establish uniformity throughout the country in the use of the best text-books, is a question which must soon be decided by the American people, for the efficiency and further progress of our schools depend upon it. In order to remedy the defect of which we are speaking, they must be brought more under the control of a central State authority, which shall prescribe the books to be used, and each school board should be instructed to supply them without cost to all pupils, to be paid for by a general tax, included in that levied for other school purposes. At all events this would be an improvement upon the present plan, which is undoubtedly the worst possible. The caprice or cupidity of a school officer or teacher too often decides what books shall be placed in the hands of children at the most formative period of their lives, and publishers do not hesitate to avail themselves of these means of extending a profitable business.

If "of making of books there is no end," there certainly is none of the devices employed for foisting them, good, bad and indifferent, into our schools. One of the most common of these is the generous offer to take the old books at a high valuation and substitute new ones, with a free copy to the teachers, who cannot fail to recommend it, while the children and often the parents are delighted with the idea of exchanging old books for new ones! Farther than this, copies of valuable works are presented to teachers and school boards, for the purpose of securing the admission of worthless text-books into the schools, and, still more, *money* has been paid, where deemed necessary, to secure that result. Such are some of the arts resorted to by enterprising publishers. That we may not seem to speak without knowledge, we give a case in point which came under our personal observation. There is a school on the Hudson, not a hundred miles from New York, where the Board of Education, not better nor worse, let us hope, than the majority of such officers, are selected, not for any fitness for the position, real or supposed, but solely for their disposition to reduce taxes to a minimum, and that in a district having an assessed valuation of over eleven hundred thousand dollars, and paying little over four thousand dollars for school purposes. Before them appeared a publisher and presented a great "Encyclopedia," the value of which, however, as a work of reference may be doubted, but not as a sedative to the text-book question in this case. *All* used in that school were henceforth ordered from that house. We mention this only as an illustration of the manner in which such works are introduced and retained in schools long after their unfitness has been demonstrated, and the means by which publishers are enabled to make such announcements as the following:

> **"No other school books ever published in this country have received *such* universal and unqualified commendation and approval as has been awarded to the Cornell series by the press, by state, country and town school officers."**

We find this upon the outside page of the "Intermediate Geography," with a flaming advertisement, and half-page picture of "D. Appleton & Co's new printing office and bookbindery." Thus before the pupil is informed of the fact that "the earth is the planet which we inhabit," he is supplied with not less important information in respect to the source from which the world is supplied with "incomparable text-books." In order that the reader may see more fully what the pretensions of these books are, we select a few more of their "claims," only premising that we have usually found the amount of puffing bestowed upon a book in inverse ratio to its merits. "They are philosophical in their arrangement, accurate in their statements, chastely and lavishly illustrated," (how *lavishly*, if not chastely, we have already seen), "and just what the *intelligent* teacher wants." Ergo, if a teacher does not think them the best in the world, so much the worse for his intelligence. It is also claimed :

> "First. That they will impart to the pupil a thorough and permanent knowledge of geography in *at least half the time heretofore required* for the purpose."
>
> "Second. That its system is mentally refreshing, capable of retaining the interest of the learner, and of putting the teacher in possession of a gauge to test, as accurately as in mathematics, what the pupil knows of the science," etc.,—(preface.)

These are mere "claims," but we must pause. The modesty of the author is "refreshing" at all events. The system of this "systematic series" for which so much is claimed is simply this. The pupil, young or old, has placed before him a map which he is to "memorize," that is, he is to commit to memory all the questions upon that map. How "mentally refreshing" and "capable of retaining the interest of the learner," this system is, may be judged from the fact that on the map of South America alone, exclusive of the boundaries of the countries and their capitals, there are two hundred and ten questions, followed by three pages of "descriptive geography" also to be "memorized."(!) In addition to this we have the review and "map questions promiscuously arranged." We read in the preface that much time is wasted by the pupil's searching the maps for the answers to questions ; in what other manner these two hundred questions are to be answered we are totally unable to discover. But we strike upon a "Memory's aid," and are relieved at the thought that the memory is to have assistance in its "refreshing" task. There is only disappointment again. The "Memory's aid" is a bare collection of names of countries, views, etc., stripped of every association by which the over-burdened mind can be aided in its efforts. When we reflect that in this system, the pupil is expected to remember not only the exercises on one map, but all in the book and throughout the whole "systematic series," it is easy to judge of their adaptation to the capacities of pupils of the ages for which the "Elementary" and "Intermediate" geographies from which we take the examples are designed.

We are also informed in the preface that one of the defects, in other works of the kind, which is entirely remedied in this series, is the "premature employment of unexplained terms." Not long since we were in one of our schools and noticed a boy poring in despair over one of the lessons in the "Intermediate Geography." We approached him and found him trying to "memorize" an article on the climate of a country. We ventured to inquire if he knew what climate is, and *found* him entirely ignorant of the meaning of the term. Upon examination of the book we find this statement upon the *eighty-sixth* page in a sort of appendix upon physical geography: "The term climate signifies the prevailing character of the weather at any place." This is the system which is so "mentally refreshing" and excites such an "interest in the learner." In the "Primary," the pupil is conducted all over the world before he knows that there is a United States. Then, if his burdened mind escapes from the icebergs of Greenland, the jungles of Asia, and the deserts of Africa, until he reaches the *seventy-fifth* page, he is allowed to learn something of his own country.

The illustrations, we read in the preface, are designed to "elevate and refine the taste of the pupil." One of these "refined and chaste" illustrations in the "Primary" (p. 62), represents the interior of a Turkish harem, and the "Light of the Harem," in all her sensual beauty, which it seems is necessary in order to "refine and elevate the taste" of young pupils. Another, in the "Intermediate" (p. 17), represents "Mexicans dancing the Fandango," which, we are assured, is taken from a "truthful and spirited design." No one can question, in this case, the truth and spirit with which that lascivious dance is represented.

The important subject of map-drawing—the advantage of which cannot be questioned in giving the pupil, in an agreeable manner, an accurate and permanent idea of a state or country, and thus relieving his mind from these endless and confusing details—the pupil has no hint of, until he has toiled through these thousands of questions to the end of the second volume, where *three* pages are devoted to it.

That it may be seen what these questions are which, in this wonderful system, the pupil is required to "memorize," we notice that among the "*important* places in New York," are Bath, Olean, and Oyster Bay, (p. 26). On the the same page more information is given in the following grammatical language: "The Oswego is formed by the junction of the Seneca and the Oneida *river.*" This may be compared with the idea which is given of the City of London. The pupil, after being informed that Paris was formerly situated on an island in the Seine, is told: "I would like to have you remember that London is situated on an island off the coast of Continental Europe," (p. 51). It is plain that an entirely incorrect idea of the *size* and situation of that island is thus conveyed to the child. We might fill pages with extracts of this kind, but we have no more space to devote to this work. We refer, in conclusion, to another of its unequalled merits, by which "the teacher is put in possession of a gauge to test as accurately as in mathematics what the pupil knows of the science." We opine that when the pupil has struggled through the confused mass of so-called instruction given in this "Systematic Series of Geographies," no very extensive "gauge" will be required to fathom his knowledge of the subject.

The Etymological Reader. By EPES SARGENT and AMASA MAY. 12mo, pp. 480. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler and Co. 1872.

So many arts are employed at the present day for the introduction of text-books into schools, that a really valuable one has little advantage over the worthless. School Boards often have so little time or talent for the examination of such that it becomes comparatively easy to foist upon them books that are worse than useless. Of the course of certain publishers who issue the like we cannot speak in terms of too severe condemnation. It equally becomes our duty, in view of the amount of spurious material in the market, for the instruction of the rising generation, to point out books that are really of a high order. Of this character, certainly, is the one now before us. "The Etymological Reader" may, at first view, appear unprepossessing to the pupil on account of its name, but, having gained an insight into the subject, he will find his first and most interesting lesson in the word itself. We take it for granted that the pupil has no previous knowledge of etymology, for we have no fear of contradiction in saying that in not one school in fifty, throughout the country, is the slightest attention paid to the subject; and this in general for the reason that the teachers themselves have very little acquaintance with it. Unless they have a classical education they cannot be expected to have this knowledge, and even then they have not the means of carrying on the instruction to classes.

Valuable works on etymology have appeared from time to time, such as "The Scholar's Companion," also issued by the publishers of the present work; but being unconnected with other exercises, they have not succeeded in exciting that interest in hunting up words, or, as our authors express it, in hunting them *down*, which is desirable. Yet, that so important and so interesting a study as that of the etymology of words in the English language should so long have been comparatively neglected, is almost unaccountable. Pupils read, day after day, some of the noblest passages in our language, entirely ignorant of the wonderful meaning hidden in the words themselves, of which etymology is the key. This work seems to supply the long-felt need. The reading exercise derives much additional interest and value from the fact that the etymology of the words is given in connection with it. And the tracing of derivations, relations, etc., of words, which may afford pleasure in itself to those already possessing some knowledge of the subject, is made interesting to the pupil of all ages by taking the words from the reading-lesson of the day. This is clearly an advantage over the method of placing in columns those words derived from the same root. Thus the two exercises mutually explain and illustrate each other. Indeed the utility of combining reading and etymology is so evident that the wonder is that it had not been done before in this country.

First we have the principles of elocution, which do not vary much from those given in the best other works on the subject. Under the head of pronunciation, many common errors are noted and corrected. We have the charity, however, to believe that "caow" and "caounty" are not very common errors. Next we have the Etymological Introduction. It is evident here that the work is condensed and pithy, the definitions being concise and, at the same time, sufficiently clear. This portion of the work is divided into parts which are considered sufficient for one lesson, to each of which is appended a list of test questions upon the section, to answer which requires very careful study of the lesson. The section upon the character of the words derived from different sources is interesting as well as instructive. We quote a paragraph as an illustration, although some of the words are not traced to their original sources:

> "To the Arabic we are indebted for admiral, alchemy, algebra, almanac, elixir, zero, zenith, etc. From the Persian we have caravan, paradise, azure, and lilac. From the Turkish we have scimitar, divan, dragoman, and chouse, from *Chiaous*, the title of an officer in the Turkish embassy who cheated the London merchants in the time of James I. From the Chinese we get gong, Nankin, Bohea, and Hyson. From the Malay we get bantam, sago, and gamboge. From India, calico, chintz, muslin, toddy and lac. From Polynesia, taboo and tattoo. From the West Indies, tobacco, potato, hurricane. From South America, hammock and jerked beef. From Italy, banditti, pantaloons, gazettes. From the Spanish, mosquitoes, negroes, alligators. From the Portuguese, palaver, caste, and marmalade. Ammonia is Egyptian; cider, Syrian; meander, Lydian," etc.

Next we have the list of prefixes and suffixes, with their meanings. Then a list of Saxon, Latin and Greek roots, with their English derivatives. The hints to the teacher are judicious and practical, showing that the work is prepared by those familiar with the wants of the school room. The "select etymologies" at the end of each reading exercise are so chosen as to give the teacher a guide as well as instruction to the pupil in those words richest in etymological connection. By this means also the work can be used to advantage by those unacquainted with the classic languages. Many of the reading-exercises are preceded by the pronunciation of new words and explanatory notes, historical, biographical, etc. The selections for reading are notably judicious. Although not entirely free from extracts from authors that are such only by courtesy, *ex more vulgare*, it is superior to all other American Readers we have seen in this respect. The selections, in general, are valuable for the information they contain, as well as for the sentiments they express. They embrace a very wide range of topics, each being the best of its class. As specimens we mention Carlyle's Characteristics of Shakespeare, Emerson on the choice of books, selections on language, by Trench and Mill; thoughts on books, by Hood, Channing, and Herschel. The poetical selections are not numerous, but excellent. In the dramatic pieces, instead of a large space to authors who cannot elsewhere find a public, we have three from Shakespeare. A characteristic feature of the work is the artificial sentences, so constructed as to bring words of the same etymological family into the same connection where they may be analyzed and compared. In short, "The Etymological Reader" is a book which we should like to see in the hands of every pupil in the land.

An Introduction to the Study of English Grammar. By SAMUEL S. GREEN, A.M., Professor in Brown University, and author of "Analysis" and "English Grammar." Philadelphia: Cowperthwait & Co. 1872.

"*Res ante Verba*" is the cheering greeting with which the venerable author offers to introduce expectant youth to the mysteries of the English grammar. Thus impressed with the importance of the subject, they will doubtless be eager to penetrate its labyrinths. This "Introduction" proposes to teach the correct *use* of language, not its *principles*. "Language is to the youth an *instrument* for immediate and practical *use*, not an *object* to be dissected and examined for other purposes,"—(preface.)

Here, then, at last, is the desideratum in grammars. The grammar-makers, like the world in general, having perseveringly exhausted every wrong method, are at last driven by the sheer lack of invention into the right one. There is to be no more stretching of the mother tongue upon the procrustean bed of the Latin, and other highly inflected languages; no more tedious hours spent in parrot-like "parsing" of the "parts of speech," instead of using them; no more analyzing and dissecting of Young and Milton, but children are to be taught to construct sentences instead of dissecting them. Keeping in mind the inscription over the door, let us enter the portico of that edifice of the extremely composite order—the English language. But how barren the prospect compared with the promising exterior! The portico is even more composite than the edifice, but as to the order—it has none.

Beginning the examination of the "correct use of language," we read in the first sentence of the preface: "The aim of this Introduction to the study of English Grammar is to aid the learner by a systematic course of exercises in his *actual use* of the language," the italics being the author's. If the correct use of language be to convey ideas without ambiguity, we very much doubt the correctness of that sentence. But passing to "Suggestions to Teachers," (p. 6) we read: "In the process of pruning and correcting let all participate, remembering that what may be regarded as *odious criticism* forms but a part of the work." Is "odious criticism," then, one of the methods by which the pupil is to be taught the "correct use of language?" The teacher, thus prepared for correcting children in the *actual use* of language, must experience something like the sensation produced by a shower-bath, as he plunges into the following statement (p. 7): "*These* things which we can see, feel, hear, smell or taste are *objects*." "This watch is an object; you can hear it. This rose is an object; you can smell it."

In the course of the "Introduction" we notice this quotation: "One of the rarest powers possessed by man is the power to state a fact." We fear our author is not one of those possessing this rare power. That the watch is an object because you can *hear* it—that is the meaning, if there is any—the rose an object, because you can *smell* it, is not a fact. That quality of the rose which is perceived by the sense of smell is an *object* of perception, so is the *sound* of the watch. Any schoolboy knows we do not smell the rose or hear the watch. At the best, it is but a half truth. Objects presented to the mind by the imagination are as much objects as those presented by sensation. Again we read (p. 9): "When we think of objects, they seem to be *present in the mind.*" "Here the appeal is to be made directly to the child's experience." A touching appeal it must be to convince any boy that he sees his father's house, grounds, trees, etc. (the illustrations are the author's), present in his mind, instead of in their relative positions as they actually exist!

The learner is informed (p. 10): "That to express our ideas we use words," etc. "Expressed, that is, *pressed out* of the hidden recesses of the mind." How much pressure was employed to "press out" the following, others may judge (p. 11): "Objects *impart* ideas." How much trouble Locke might have spared himself about the "origin of ideas," could he have seen this "Introduction to English Grammar!" Again (p. 12) we read: "To express a thought we say something of some *object.*" Another less than half truth, for more of our expressions have reference to ideas than to external objects.

With these lucid instructions to the pupil, and a plentiful supply of blanks for the teacher, the author concludes in sixteen pages the exercises in the "actual use" of language. Here he falls into the beaten path of the grammar-makers, beginning by ringing the changes upon "The child is crying," to "Oh, how that child cries!" Stopping to inquire (p. 18): "Do any of you say ca-ow, sich, them's'em?" and finally, having conducted the pupil thus far, he asks him to "*Try* to improve these expressions, 'Wher 'bouts is our gog'raphy lesson?' 'Can I borry your slate?'" (p. 23). Not an unreasonable request, surely. Having accomplished this task, the pupil is prepared to correct these expressions (p. 52): "'Tain't no good; plase may I get me slate off of Quinn; she jawed her mother," etc. With the "intermediate course" (p. 54) begins in the stereotyped manner, "Grammar is the science," etc. The youth who has followed thus far the bright star promising to guide him to the "correct use of language," suddenly sees its light expire, and finds himself led by an *ignis fatuus* into the sloughs of grammar. Here he is left floundering amid conjugations and inflections, beset by unintelligible words and definitions, while assailing rules spring up on every hand like dragons' teeth. For instance, he is challenged (p. 96) to "predicate the assumed and assume the predicated," and is confronted by the rule, "Subordinate connectives are used to unite dissimilar elements." Indeed, were it not for the numerous "cautions" in this portion of the work by which the adventurous youth is admonished of the dangers of his pathway, he might despair altogether.

Persevering until he reaches page 130, he is informed that "the way is prepared for a successful course in syntax." Entering upon this broad expanse, he sees "boy learned," which, after the model of a famous dwelling said to have been erected by one Jack, soon expands into the little boy who never neglected his duty—learned his lesson carefully during the time assigned for study. Escaping from the mazes of Syntax, Prosody awaits him, as a portion of the "Introduction to English Grammar," to mould his remaining thoughts into verse. Some more commandments are added to the decalogue, such as (p. 196): "All the terms of a coördinate series, except the final *one*, should be separated by the comma." Plenty of "false syntax" is interspersed, and the youth who entered with so bright hopes of acquiring the "correct use" of the language, emerges, perhaps, with as much knowledge of it as when he entered, and is prepared to advance from the "Introduction" to "English Grammar"—by the same author.

In short the work, while professing to follow the philosophical method of teaching the use of language *by using* it, soon lapses into ordinary grammar, the performance falling deplorably short of the promise. Although written for beginners, it employs terms found in no civilized tongue, while, on the other hand, where the greatest clearness and simplicity of expression are necessary, it employs obscure and unintelligible terms.

We almost despair of seeing the book which will teach the correct use of our language, and deliver it from the grave of the dead languages, into which the grammarians have so long endeavored to force it. At all events, we may conclude with our author that "We are as yet only in the rudiments of the great science of education."

---

1. *First Book in German.* By E. C. F. KRAUS. Teacher at the Mass. Institute of Technology, and at the Girls' High School, Boston. 12mo. Thompson, Bigelow & Brown. 1872.
2. *Elements of German Grammar.* By the same.

The best method of teaching the modern languages has long been an earnest question among competent instructors, and the most rapid method of acquiring a knowledge of them, an equally earnest question of pupils. To meet these two demands, two different classes of text-books have been issued. The first, which may be characterized as the theatrical assuming the grammatical form, aims to teach the language as a science. The second, as practical, casting aside the more grammatical portions, aims to give the pupil phrases and idioms by which he may be able, in the shortest possible time, to converse in the language. Both have their faults as well as their advantages. The former, by burdening the mind with a system of paradigms and rules with their numerous progeny of exceptions, fails to give sufficient exercise in their application. The latter gives the pupil an inadequate idea of the strength and copiousness of the language, its etymology and relations to other tongues.

To strike the happy mean between these two, to teach the language scientifically and at the same time give a clear exposition of its idioms so as to enable the pupil to acquire them in the least time, is certainly not an easy task. Yet, in this particular, Mr. Kraus's works seem to meet very nearly the great want, and answer the main requirements of the two classes, namely: completeness and simplicity. As the work is designed for beginners, we do not expect the fulness of detail in the department of syntax which we should in more advanced works, yet we think the author has succeeded in his attempt to give "the greatest possible amount of useful information in the least possible compass." The distinguishing feature of the "First Book," is the exemplification of the author's first maxim that "practice" must precede "theory." This is also one of its most commendable features. Thus a great burden is lifted from the mind of both pupil and teacher. What was before a meaningless task and irksome duty, becomes at once a source of pleasure and instruction.

Instead of a set of sentences made to order to illustrate a given rule, such as "Why does the cook buy the tea, the coffee, the oil, the pepper, the salt, and the vinegar?" which we find in most "methods with German," we have an interesting story which runs through the book. The first sentence the pupil reads is one which excites his interest and makes him desirous to continue. From this, in the most natural, and hence easy manner, the author educes and explains the necessary principles, beginning with the more simple and proceeding to those more complex. Thus the pupil learns the correct German idiom without being able to form an incorrect one as he does in translating set sentences from English. The true aim is, not to be able to translate correctly, but to think in the language. Also by frequent reading and repetition of the German text, the ear becomes accustomed to correct forms and associations of words in the easiest and most efficient manner. Thus many of the difficulties of gender and inflection are bridged over. All new words and meanings are given and explained, which, after being repeated twice, the pupil is required to remember. .He is also required to make a list of all new words, verbs, etc., with their inflection parts and other modifications. Thus he makes his grammar as he proceeds. The whole plan of the "First Book" is notably synthetical and progressive, and it seems to us founded upon a correct comprehension of the province of grammar in teaching a modern language. To set a pupil to learn the grammar before he has any knowledge of the language, is an inversion of the natural order of things. This work does not claim to teach German grammar, but German itself, and must succeed.

As a companion to the "First Book" for reference, we have the "Elements of Grammar," which as a comprehensive and philosophically arranged text-book we have never seen surpassed. The pupil, instead of being confused by the "old, new, and mixed" declensions, with different forms for the genders in each, here finds them so collected and classified, as very much to simplify the subject of gender, the great obstacle to an Englishman's acquiring familiarity with German. Adopting Grimm's nomenclature of the strong and weak declensions, we have two forms in the singular, one for each, and four in the plural; three for the strong and one for the weak. Remembering that the feminine singular is indeclinable, and that there is but one form for all genders in the weak declension, and only three for the plural in the strong, the matter of gender is made easily comprehensible by the youngest pupil. The same classification is adopted in the conjugation of the verbs, those being called "strong" which have a greater power of expressing different relations by a variety of forms. In short, the "Elements" is as much an improvement upon German grammars as the "First Book" is upon methods of teaching the language. In the hands of competent progressive teachers we predict for them a wide field of usefulness in opening to speakers of English the rich treasures of German literature.

Violets. To Our Parents and Friends. From the Young Ladies of Mlle. TARDIVEL'S *Institution.* Small *brochure*, pp. 30. 1872.

No fact is more universally accepted in every enlightened country than that French ladies are the best teachers of their own sex. Nor is this faith a new one; it is three centuries old. Moreover, it rarely excites any jealousy or prejudice among the cultivated ladies of any other country, because this class are aware how much the women of all the great nations owe those of France as, having been the first to prove to the modern world, both by precept and example, that woman, when properly educated, is fully the equal of man in all those intellectual traits and qualities that tend to elevate human nature and enhance the charms of life.

The female authors of France have not merely exercised a powerful refining influence on their own people; their power has been felt to a greater or less extent in every civilized country. It is not alone Mme. De Staël and Mme. De Sevigné, whose writings are studied in England, Germany, Italy, Spain and the United States, under the direction of the highest class of educators. These illustrious cultivators of the public taste of the world are but types of different classes of their countrywomen. But great injustice is done to the French authoresses of the present day by those who, having but a limited acquaintance with the facts, judge all by a few novelists of the "sensational" class. As one error leads to another, so there are a large number of well-meaning but thoughtless people, who judge by the caricatures in the növels of such authors the whole of the women of France—among whom have been found at least as many exemplary wives and mothers—noble specimens of the sex of whom Mme. La Valette is but the representative—as among the women of any other country in the world, ancient or modern.

We are concerned now, however, only with those ladies who, as we have said, are to be found engaged in teaching in every country in Christendom—nay, in every city and town where any attention is bestowed on culture and taste. Even Bismarck would throw no obstacle in the way of these good ladies, let their theological or political views be what they may. Nay, it may be mentioned to his credit that during the war he took particular pains to protect from insult and injury the large number of French ladies having charge of schools or seminaries in all the principal cities of Germany, but especially in Berlin. True, no protection against the intelligent classes of Germany was necessary; those good ladies were as safe among them as their sisters are among ourselves; but even in Prussia, with all its educational advantages, there is the unreasoning multitude, whose sense of right cannot be relied upon, especially in time of war.

But why are French ladies everywhere recognized thus, as superior to the ladies of other nationalities whose education is equally good? Various explanations are given, but the one most generally accepted among educators is the greater vivacity of the French woman, and the more earnest enthusiasm with which they devote themselves to the instruction of the young. Duclos, in describing the French character, makes the following remarkable observation:—"Le grand defaut du Français est d'avoir toujours la caractère jeune."* The same enduring marks of youthfulness, both intellectual and physical, are noted by Goldsmith in his "Traveller," but certainly not as a defect. Assuming, however, that this liveliness of spirit even "beneath the burden of three score" is a defect in men engaged in some of the graver pursuits of life, it by no means follows that it is a defect in ladies devoted to the education of the youth of their own sex. In our opinion it is the reverse, and may be regarded as the secret of the wonderful success of French ladies as teachers.

That they do succeed, at all events, and, we are glad to add, succeed in this country, as well as in any other, is beyond question. Our readers can easily recall sufficient illustrations of the fact; they are aware, for instance, that among the several excellent schools we have in New York, there is not one that stands higher, or occupies a more enviable position than one founded and still conducted by a French lady; nor is there one, the thoroughness of whose system is more fully appreciated by those of our citizens best qualified to form an adequate estimate of its worth.

And if we turn to other cities we shall find the daughters of France equally distinguished for their success as educators. Take Philadelphia, for example; there is the Chegary Institute whose principal is Mme. D'Hervilly, and whose well-earned fame as a high-school for young ladies is as broad as this continent. The fine type of a French lady, who is at the head of the Chegary Institute, has grown gray before her time in the noble but onerous work of teaching; although she has lost none of the vigor, the vivacity, or even the enthusiasm of early womanhood. Indeed, never was Mme. D'Hervilly more powerful as a teacher than she is at this moment, and we may be permitted to add that never was she more brilliant or more fascinating as a conversationalist, whether she uses her own admirably polite language, or our more matter-of-fact and less polished Anglo-Saxon.

The lady from whose School comes the *brochure* whose title stands at the head of these remarks, is probably a stranger to most of our readers; but we have the strongest assurances that she is entitled to be ranked as an educator of young ladies with those—the most accomplished of her countrywomen in this country—to whom we have just alluded. We trust we violate no confidence by remarking that the first intimation we received as to the high character of Mlle Tardivel's School was from a well-known college President; one worthily ranked among the best of American educators. Knowing from long experience that this gentleman would recommend no school which was not faithful and thorough, we readily believed that that of Mlle. Tardivel deserves to be encouraged. Nor had we any difficulty in ascertaining that the estimate of the good college President was by no means peculiar—that, in a word, there can be no question among those competent to judge in regard either to the high qualifications of the lady, or to her success in giving a thorough training to the young ladies under her charge. Now, whatever the selfish, who judge the motives of others by their own, may think to the contrary, we have no other object in recommending Mlle. Tardivel's School to those who are capable of appreciating the value of such, than to do good, and the only reward we shall claim, or wish, is the consciousness of having succeeded in attaining that object.

---

* Considerations sur les Mœurs, chap. II.

We may anticipate a question by remarking that we would take at least equal pains with American ladies struggling in a similar manner in France, or any other European country. We have sought to do justice to the acknowledged merits of the daughters of France in the above remarks, because, in spite of their vivacity and enthusiasm, we can never contemplate one of these good ladies engaged in teaching in a foreign land, without being reminded of that beautiful and touching simile:

"Like yon neglected shrub, at random cast,
That shades the steep, and sighs at every blast."

The tiny pamphlet, appropriately called "Violets," is abundantly modest. Its contents are presented only as "first attempts at versification;" and, regarded in this light, they are certainly creditable both to teachers and students. There is at least one good precept of Boileau which the young ladies have strictly observed:

"N'offrez point un sujet d'incidents trop chargé."[*]

But, in our mind, the chief value of "Violets" consists in the agreeable and satisfactory evidence its versified contents afford of the fact that although French is the language of Mlle. Tardivel's School, the English is thoroughly studied there under competent instructors, who fully understand its resources.

---

[*] *L'Art Poetique*, Chant. III.

An Elementary Geometry and Trigonometry. By **William F. Bradbury**, A.M. 12mo, pp. 171. Boston: Thompson, Bigelow & Brown.

There is a large and rapidly increasing class of text-books, known as "Short Courses," "Elementary," etc., which, although designed for beginners and for those not able to pursue the subject farther, are frequently written by those having the most thorough acquaintance with their theme, and are supplying a great want. In this class we place the work before us. Its object, as the author states in the preface, is to conduct the pupil by the "shortest path to the desired end." Assuming this to be an acquaintance with the practical methods dependent upon geometry and plane trigonometry, he gives only such theorems and demonstrations as are necessary to attain it. Most of those omitted are given in the appended exercises, of which the pupil is to "develop the proof if he has sufficient time and ability." These exercises will be found useful as illustrating the principles and serving to fasten them in the memory. Many excellent "problems in construction" are added, which will be valuable, if the pupil, in his desire to find the "shortest path," etc., does not omit them entirely. We can, however, but deprecate the prevailing spirit which would turn all sciences to a solely "practical" purpose. It seems that even the pure mathematics must go at last, when we see geometry forced to grind in the mill of trigonometry, which in its turn is the caterer for surveying, etc.

Yet we would not say that such is the scope of this work. As serving to give an acquaintance with mathematical methods, and at the same time as an introduction to the more complete work, it is eminently adapted for its purpose. The definitions are clear and concise, the demonstrations as brief as possible, in conformity with the general plan of the work; the examples numerous and practical. Enough of plane trigonometry is given, both in the geometrical and analytical methods, to enable the pupil to solve the simpler problems; to which are appended the logarithmic tables. Indeed, considered as an elementary work, it is remarkably comprehensive, and although there is a difference of opinion among educators as to the "desired end," in this class of text-books, we doubt not that it will be favorably received in our schools.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

The Desert of the Exodus: Journeys on Foot in the Wilderness of the Forty Years' Wanderings, etc., with Maps and numerous Illustrations from Photographs taken on the Spot, etc., etc. By E. H. Palmer, M. A. 8vo, pp. 470. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

This work is divided into two general divisions; the first giving an account of the journey from Suez to Sinai, and the explorations in its vicinity; the other being a narrative of the journeyings in the wilderness of the forty years' wanderings. As a book of travel and adventure it is full of interest to the general reader. It also possesses much value to the biblical student, and to all interested in Scripture history. As the journey was undertaken in connection with a scientific expedition, it partakes somewhat of that character. Yet personal experience with the inhabitants of the desert, and acute observations upon their characters and customs, are so interspersed as to render the whole entertaining. Its interest as a narrative of travel, however, is subordinate to its value as a work of research in a comparatively new and undeveloped field. The identification of the more important localities in the march of the Israelites from Egypt to Palestine is important in its bearings upon that event, as well as upon all history. In this feature of the work consists its recommendation to the biblical student, although he may hesitate to adopt all the author's conclusions. These are generally given in a candid manner, and evidently based upon careful observation. Mainly the author adopts the philosophical method of giving the results of his observations, and leaving conclusions to be drawn by the reader.

It is a note-worthy fact, that so interesting a locality should so long have remained unvisited for the purposes of accurate investigation, to the world in general comparatively a *terra incognita.* Although the peninsula was frequently visited by travellers on account of its religious associations, they were generally of a character to add to, rather than decrease, the superstitions of the place. The monks, also, who had erected their retreats upon the top of Sinai itself, did not fail to impart a traditional interest to every locality. Thus the pilgrim was enabled to find within short distance of the monastery all points more or less holy. Again, the Arabs had invested nearly every mountain and rock with some legend of Meusa, the great prophet. The traveller is shown a rock which split to allow the prophet to pass through; the mound of the calf, which requires much faith to detect a likeness to a calf, or anything else; the spot in which the tables of the law were buried; and the rock struck by Moses, which a legend supposes to have followed the children of Israel through all their wanderings, and to have furnished them with a constant supply of water—a true water-barrel in fact, always on tap.

To sift this mass of traditionary evidence, and establish its value as a means of identification, fell, in the division of labor, to the author. This task he has performed with care and skill, and has derived therefrom much that is valuable. The accompanying incidents are related in a style of easy familiarity which makes the reader a companion of the author in his changeful experiences in the mountains and desert. His account of his first reception by the natives is characteristic both of his style and of the race among whom he had fallen:

> "A noisy crowd, dressed in every variety of costume which we are accustomed to associate with dramatic pictures of Blue Beard (1*d.* plain, 2*d.* colored), awaited the arrival of the train, and a dozen sturdy Moslems at once began a contest for the possession of my baggage. As I did not interfere, they followed me to the hotel in a sort of funeral procession, with four bearers to each of my two modest portmanteaus, my umbrella, as chief mourner, bringing up the rear. For all this pomp I disbursed a *sebian*—not quite three pence."

An interesting specimen of this type of Arab character is Alel Salem, his faithful and devout attendant, of whom he relates the following anecdote:

> "Upon the recall of one of the party, that worthy's grief was both profound and characteristic. He watched the retreating form for some minutes with an expression of incredulous amazement, and when he had sufficiently realized the painful fact, applied his dirty sleeve to his eyes, and, sobbing outright, retired to hide his sorrow behind a neighboring stone. After a few minutes, he returned with red eyes and unwiped cheeks, and thus delivered himself, 'God bless him! Four *times has* he been in this country, *and never cursed me once.*'"

In the course of the explorations about Sinai, they found many remains of stone circle and beehive dwellings, and tombs of a long-departed race. The desert, also, is rich in these remains and those of ancient cities that once flourished where now all is desolation. The author does not attempt to give the history of these ruins, but merely records his impressions, leaving that to the antiquary and archæologist. In the Sinai district, also, he notes the existence of numerous mines of copper and turquoise, which were formerly worked on a large scale by the ancient Egyptians. In the neighborhood of these, many Egyptian inscriptions are found, showing the manner of working the mines, and under what monarchs the operations were conducted. These the author regards as of much greater antiquity and value than the "Semetic inscriptions." The remains of slag-heaps and smelting-furnaces lead to the conclusion that portions of the country, at least, must have been densely wooded, and that the forests were cut down for fuel. The destruction of the forests has resulted, of course, in an almost entire suspension of the rainfall which, added to the physical configuration of the country, explains its terribly barren state. We may ask, in passing, how many centuries will elapse before the lavish and ignorant destruction of the timber in many parts of our own country will result in reducing regions, which now "bloom like the rose," to the aridity of Sinai? In his second visit to the country, the author's experiences were of a more unpleasant and serious nature, resulting from the character of the Bedouin Arabs with whom he came in contact. He expresses himself on the "Bedouin question" in the following not very flattering terms:

> "The sympathy already wasted upon the red men of North America warns me that I am treading upon delicate grounds, but I must, nevertheless, state my belief that the noble savage is a simple and unmitigated nuisance. To the Bedouin, this applies more forcibly still, for, wherever he goes, he brings ruin, violence, and neglect. To call him a 'son of the desert' is a misnomer; half the desert owes its existence to him, and many a fertile plain, from which he has driven the useful and industrious inhabitants, becomes, in his hands, a parched and barren wilderness."

This portion of the narrative is sufficiently seasoned with danger and difficulty to render it palatable to those readers who prefer highly flavored condiments. Many of the more important points in the route of the Israelites from Sinai to Palestine are quite conclusively identified, and made the key to the whole route. The value of these researches, as furnishing corroborative proof of the Scripture history, will be variously estimated, according as the evidence seems satisfactory, and the facts pertinent to the question. Yet this is one of the incidental features of the work, its main object being to give such information as will enable all to judge for themselves. At the same time, it throws much light upon a hitherto neglected field, and is a valuable contribution to the physical geology of that portion of the globe. The purely scientific results of the expedition have doubtless been communicated to the parties under whose auspices it was undertaken. But the author's account, while embodying sufficient of these results, also embraces so much that is new and interesting, expressed in a happy manner, as will render it popular with all intelligent classes.

Goethe: His Life and Works. An Essay. By GEORGE H. CALVERT. 16mo, pp. 275. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham. 1872.

IT is not within the compass of the author's purpose to discuss fully in this volume the life and writings of so great and many-sided a man as Goethe, but to describe him from a few of the many points of view in which such a man may be seen. These are indicated by the subjects of the several chapters, such as Weimar and Italy, Goethe and Schiller, The Loves of Goethe, Faust, etc. In his opening chapter, Mr Calvert remarks that to a large class of readers Goethe is an immense nebulous figure, known as the author of Faust and a few other poems. He has endeavored to clear away these clouds and throw light upon this ill-defined colossus; but it remains none the less great and imposing still. Its form and features are seen in all their grandeur and beauty, yet tinged, in this light, with a golden hue not wholly its own. Our author stands in awe before this great figure, and can only express himself in terms of indiscriminate admiration. Thus *Hermann and Dorothea* is "heavenly" (p. 25), "The fire of his genius is fed with sap-ful fuel," etc. (p. 37).

He also lacks the intrepidity to call by their proper names what he is assured are faults and errors, but covers them with the broad veil of charity, "judge not." It might be well if the same spirit of charitableness were extended to others of less distinction than Goethe. In the first chapter, "Weimar and Italy," our author shows the statesman and man of business behind the poet, and the ardent youth imbibing wisdom and inspiration from the thousand sources found in Rome and Italy. That on "Schiller and Goethe" gives an interesting reminiscence of the manner in which the two great poets were finally drawn together by their discussion of Goethe's pet theory on the "metamorphoses of plants" (p. 78).

Goethe was not a greater poet than he was a lover. The history of his loves—ranging from the first pure gushings of his youthful heart toward Gretchen, to his more intellectual, if not more questionable, attachment for Frau Von Stein, while his conduct toward Christiane cannot certainly be considered a model for less gifted mortals—forms one of the most instructive pages in human annals. To the completeness of Goethe's daily being, a "maiden" was essential. In one of the earlier letters of *Werther* he exclaims: "To the heart, what is the world without love? What a magic lantern is without its light!" (p. 153.) The author gives utterance to an oft-expressed thought when he says: "What would not one give for only half a dozen love-letters of Shakespeare?" "From Goethe we have more than a thousand to Frau Von Stein alone, covering a space of fifty years" (p. 163).

The chapter on Faust contains some fine selections from that incomparable poem. From his abundance of materials, the author has, with a keen appreciation of the Protean nature of his subject, selected such as will throw much light upon the character of this wonderful man.

The Character and Career of Francis Asbury, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Illustrated by numerous Selections from his Journal, arranged in chronological order. 12mo, pp. 615. By Rev. EDWIN L. JAMES. Compiler of "Wesley His Own Historian." New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1872.

FOLLOWING the same general plan as in "Wesley His Own Historian," the author has made the subject write nearly all of his own history, himself collecting and arranging the materials, which are presented without comment. For this, abundant opportunity is given in the journal of Mr. Asbury, which, begun upon his embarking for America, is continued through all his remarkable vicissitudes in a very careful manner. The entries are so arranged by the compiler as to present a continuous narrative of all the important events from that time until his death, embracing nearly all the early history of American Methodism. As his life was one of constant travel, the State is also given in which the entry is made. In opening this journal, one is struck by the quaint and simple manner of his expression, which forcibly recalls the style of Bunyan. The familiarity with which he speaks of the Deity and of his presence whenever and wherever desired, will appear to some amusing. Thus we find him in one of his first entries:

> "The people God owns in England are the Methodists. The Lord has greatly blessed these doctrines and this discipline in three kingdoms; they must, therefore be pleasing to him" (p. 25).

The "therefore" indicates a logic which, if carried out, would bring God's blessing upon Mohamedanism, Mormonism, and all other successful isms; but it seems that this was not confined to England. Upon his arrival in this country, we find him preaching in Westchester, where he makes this entry: "On the Lord's Day morning, a considerable company being gathered together, I stood up in the Lord's power; yea, I felt the Holy One was nigh." December 7, 1780, he writes the following in regard to the effect of prayer, which might be commended to the attention of those professing to adopt Tyndall's test: "About three days since, I was moved to pray for good weather, when I saw what a condition we should be in. There is a change in the weather, blessed be God." Three days later, he adds, "The devil throws his firebrands, but grace is sufficient." He seems to have given a cold reception to his Satannic majesty, judging by this entry (p. 91). "When the tempter finds that his violent assaults only draw us nearer to God, perhaps he will not be so maliciously officious."

There is quaint wit in some of his observations. Thus, after a three hours' discussion with the Baptists, he says, "No doubt but Satan is very active in promoting religious controversies" (p. 79). He thus speaks of a "Quaker meeting" in terms not very gallant, but we remember that Mr. Asbury never married: "I visited the Quaker meeting, but wondered to see so many sensible men sit to hear two or three old women talk" (p. 70). We notice the same spirit in his note on "Brother Hurtley's" marriage. He says, "I find the care of a wife begins to humble my young friend. I have thought he always carried too great sail, but he will have ballast now."

With all his idiosyncrasies, his life was one of wonderful labor. He was often in want of the necessaries of life, while his zeal may be seen in such notes as the following, with which his journal abounds:

> "I have now been sick near ten months, and many days closely confined; yet I have preached about three hundred times, and rode near two thousand miles in that time, though very frequently in a high fever. Here is no ease, worldly profit or honor."

Besides interesting personal reminiscences, the book abounds in instructive reference to the more noted men and events of that stirring time. Upon the work of such a man it is difficult to place a proper estimate. The biographer thus sums up his labors:

> "In his unparalleled itinerant career, he preached about sixteen thousand five hundred sermons, and travelled about two hundred and seventy thousand miles, presiding in no less than two hundred and twenty-four annual conferences, and ordaining more than four thousand preachers."

The School and the Army in Germany and France; with a Diary of Siege Life at Versailles. By Brevet Maj.-Gen. W. B. HAZEN, U.S.A., Colonel Sixth Infantry. 12mo. pp. 400. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.

ANYTHING relating to the Franco-Prussian war, especially whatever tends to elucidate the cause of its startling termination, will be favorably received at the present time, while its memory is fresh in the minds of all. Although it was well known that the ancient animosity between the two nations was liable to break forth in war at any time, and that since the triumphal entry of Napoleon I. into Berlin Prussia had been awaiting the opportunity to avenge her injuries, yet the world in general was not prepared for the complete triumph and corresponding disaster which followed.

In the volume before us we have the causes of that result made known as they appeared to a man of military education and experience, with observations on the field of strife, both before and during the war. The author says, in his introduction, that after a visit to the French camp at Chalons in 1867, what he then saw of the tone and character of the French army and people made the events which followed three years later a foregone conclusion. It is evident, however, at the first glance, that Gen. Hazen is strongly biased in favor of the Germans. This he acknowledges in the opening chapter, and again at the close of the volume, where he says he has found so much to admire in the simple, earnest life of the German people, and has endeavored to be just in his criticisms upon French characters and methods. He has generally succeeded in his treatment of the military systems of the two countries, and of the schools upon which they are respectively based. But in speaking of the two peoples we find only praise of the Germans, and that in unqualified terms of admiration, while of the French, especially of the lower classes, he speaks in terms of severe criticism. From his pages one might infer that Bismarck was the most unambitious of statesmen, William the most liberal of sovereigns, and the Germans the only noble type of mankind, whereas the French are selfish, unenlightened, haughty, and vindictive! None think more highly of the Germans than we do ourselves. Their integrity, industry, and bravery need no vindication; but as regards France our author's assumption is as unjust as it is illogical. France, although defeated, is and ever will be great. Even since the war she has given to the world unmistakable evidence of her inherent strength in the patient and patriotic manner in which her people, unheeding the reproach which has been cast upon them, have gone to work to repair the losses of the war, and pay the debt which an unrelenting foe had imposed upon them. Never was that wonderful recuperative power, which she has shown in so many reverses, more strikingly illustrated. The world cannot, and will not, forget the debt it owes to France, upon whose fields were wrought out many of the grandest problems of modern civilization, while Germany, as the greatest of her own thinkers tells us, was yet but a wilderness, sending her fierce hordes to ravage the fertile plains of Normandy. Neither is lost to the world the example of steady, unflinching devotion to principle, which the Germanic people have ever evinced. The efforts of the real friends of German unity and liberty have the good-will of all mankind; but it cannot be denied that those now in control of German affairs desire no unity but what centres in the Emperor, and no liberty not subordinate to his will. France has gained more liberty and made more republican progress as the result of the war than Germany. Prussia, at best, has only gained for the cause of German unity what her previous self-aggrandizing course had lost.

We make these remarks that we may not appear to have unjustly criticised our author's partiality. Nor would we be understood as saying that this partiality, though it may at times betray him into too general commendations, is so excessive as to neutralize the interest of the narrative portion of the work, or the value of the remaining portion upon the army and school.

As we have indicated, the first part is a narrative of the author's experience upon the field of conflict, and his observations upon military operations, and the armies and leaders engaged in them. This comparison of the two armies, which is evidently just, shows that the German army was vastly superior to the French in organization, unity, leadership, and the *morale* of the troops. Napoleon was undoubtedly right in attributing the cause of his defeat to the fact that the Germans were ready too soon for him. They had been perfecting for many years that military system which now stands among the best in the world. This part of the work is enlivened by descriptions of persons and places, anecdotes, and illustrations taken from the author's own experience in the late war. But from his description of the German troops who were quartered upon the inhabitants, we might infer that they were little less than angels in disguise whom the obstinate French had not the discernment to appreciate. He says:

> "The kindest relations seem to exist between host and guest, all over the city, as soon as they understand each other. The soldiers are everywhere favorites when they become domesticated, doing all manner of littleaffairs for the family, and going errands, caring for the children, and helping about the house" (p. 64).

If cruel Mars must still go forth, it is to be hoped that he will always thus soften his stern features! Of the Crown Prince, also, he says: "His face expresses so much that is good as to preclude the fear that he will ever be unjust" (!) (p. 76). Our author evidently has great faith in humanity, especially humanity of the Hohenzollern type.

The second portion of the work is devoted to the history, organization. and condition of the army and school in the two countries. Here, as we have seen, the advantage is decidedly with Germany. Our author's comparative observations upon our own army are very interesting and instructive, if not very encouraging or flattering to our national pride. Some of the faults he notes in our army are the enlistment of men for their physical qualifications alone, without reference to moral character, by which thieves and cut-throats are enlisted who, as might be expected, soon become deserters and "bounty jumpers." He also condemns the undue number and influence of staff officers, the appointment and promotion of officers by favor and political influence, and the extravagance in all departments. Upon this point he makes some valuable suggestions, and asks some pertinent questions, which men are beginning to ask in relation to other departments of our government, and which statesmen may well ponder. We quote the paragraph entire:

> "It was common to hear that the State received no more than half the service it paid for, and it appears to be a settled sentiment that the State cannot be served with the economy one finds in private affairs. This is an unfortunate misapprehension, but one that cannot be corrected till we employ systems in which educated reason, and not political expediency and personal favor, shall govern. If our system required a million men on the rolls of the army, under the pay of the nation which was losing their industries, to get two hundred and fifty thousand men in the front line with muskets in their hands, when we might have had the same number of

> **muskets there with but half a million on its rolls, then our system was not the best. If we had seventy-five thousand officers under commission and pay, when we only required fifteen thousand, then our system was not the best. If we paid for the best quality of clothing, blankets, hats, stationery, and a long list of necessary articles, and received only shoddy and shams, then our system was not the best. If we lost half a million of lives, when by some other course we could have conducted the war as effectively, and lost but a hundred thousand, then our system was not the best. If our war cost six hundred millions of dollars, when it need not have cost more than two hundred millions, then our system was not the best" (p. 246).**

The observations upon the school systems of the two countries are, as the author states, principally compilations, but in most cases made with care and judgment. The connection between the school and the army is so intimate that he gives them together as the cause of which the result of the war is the effect. The universities of both countries are too well known to require comment. The history of popular education in France is one of repeated attempts and failures to supply the masses with mental aliment. Gen. Hazen pays a just tribute to the self-sacrificing and noble work of the order of the Christian Brothers in teaching the poor. It was, he testifies, purely a labor of love, and their success was commensurate with their devotion (p. 347). In the better education of the masses, we find the ground of that high *morale* which, combined with their superior military system, gave the Prussians their easy victory. The author has so arranged and presented the facts as to lead logically to this conclusion. They are generally stated in a candid manner, and illustrated so as to render the whole very readable. An appendix is added giving the organization and equipment of the German army, which we also commend to the perusal of those interested in such matters.

SCIENCE AND JOURNALISM.

Primeval Man. An Examination of some Recent Speculations. 12mo. pp. 200. By the Duke of Argyll. New York: De Witt C. Lent & Co. 1872.

All questions relating to the origin, antiquity, and primitive condition of our race, are of deep interest to the majority of readers as well as to the scientist. These are briefly discussed in the neat little volume before us, which, although it is stated to be merely "an examination of some recent speculations," treats of many of the grandest and deepest problems affecting humanity, each of which is sufficiently suggestive and comprehensive to fill volumes. In discussing these questions, the author evinces, as in his former publications, a thorough acquaintance with the latest developments of science, and a candid and intrepid manner of dealing with the conclusions of the most noted scientists, such as Darwin, Huxley and Sir J. Lubbock.

The argument is mainly a reply to that of Sir J. Lubbock, who claims that the primitive condition of man was one of "utter barbarism." This, in its turn, is a reply to the argument of Archbishop Whateley, that nowhere could man, by his own unaided powers, have risen from a condition of complete helplessness and ignorance. Both of these positions the author shows to be untenable, or, at least, very difficult to maintain. The main argument against the "savage theory," is the fact of the tendency to degradation observed in man everywhere, and that all savages are found at the extremities of the earth, where they have been pushed from the centres of population by the multiplication of the species. Against Archbishop Whateley's argument the Duke advances the fact, that many of man's first acts, such as throwing a stone or wielding a stick, are as purely instinctive as a brute's use of its own organs of defence, and here his reasoning faculties stepping in, he begins the conquest of intellect over force. He deals the development theory of man's origin a heavy blow, in showing the co-relation of man's anatomical structure to his mental faculties, and in the fact that in proportion as man's reasoning faculties were developed his physical frame became weaker. Hence, unless his intellect was considerably developed first, on the principle of the "survival of the fittest" he would have perished altogether.

In regard to the antiquity of man, the Duke of Argyll comes to the conclusion pursued on several lines of scientific inquiry, that it is very great; and this he regards as going far to show the unity of the race. We have merely glanced at the arguments pursued and the questions discussed, but commend the perusal of this little volume to all who like an agreeable and instructive companion.

Brittan's Journal. Spiritual Science, Literature, Art, and Inspiration. Quarterly. S. B. BRITTAN, M. D., Editor. Vol. 1, No. 1, 8vo, pp. 144. New York, 1872.

It is but rarely that we can spare the least time from our own journal to devote attention to any other. When we do so, however, it is never to depreciate the efforts of our contemporaries. Far from attempting to cast any obstacles in the way of those who evince any aptitude for the vocation they have chosen, together with a proper sense of the moral duties which it involves, it is our wish to give them all the encouragement in our power, let their religious or political creed be what it may. The only condition we require from a journal exhibiting culture and ability, is that it treat with due deference the social fabric as constructed and approved by the enlightened common sense of modern civilization.

In the present instance there is no risk in this respect. Although that before us is the first number of "Brittan's Journal," its editor is a veteran journalist. There are few, if any, abler writers in America than Dr. Brittan; in the peculiar field to which he has devoted himself he has no equal. Our readers know that none have less faith in what is called "Spiritualism" than we. We believe in no miracles but those of science—the results of irrevocable laws. Nevertheless we have read several of Dr. Brittan's essays on Spiritualism with interest and pleasure; if he has not succeeded in making a convert of us, however, it is because no one could.

We believe that most of our readers are equally fortified, at least against the modern class of ghosts, and, therefore, we do not hesitate to recommend *Brittan's Journal.* We acknowledge its decided merits all the more readily, because if the editor occasionally introduces a ghost or two in his essays, they are not of the vulgar tribe—they are, in fact, philosophical, interesting, instructive ghosts. Moreover, we are satisfied that he will not allow his contributors—of whom he has quite a galaxy already—to introduce any of the common herd of "spirits." And need we care much whether the spirit is genuine or spurious, if he entertains, amuses, or instructs us? There are but few who regard the ghost in Hamlet as a real representative of the nether world; and still fewer think the less of that noble drama on account of its ghost, even when the latter stalks about in its clumsiest fashion. By all means, then, let "Brittan's Journal" be read. We wish we could extract a large part of the Editor's "Salutatory," addressed to "the Friends of Progress," replete as it is with striking thoughts; but we can only make room for the opening paragraph:

> "Revolutions are the thoughts endowed with life and locomotion. Some revolutions proceed in a noiseless manner, so as really to endanger no human interest; and these, especially, are most potent. Like the gravitation that moves worlds, these silent forces are greater in their development, and far more lasting in their effects, than the shock that rends a continent, and rocks the globe to its centre. The boom of thunders and the hoarse voices of the sea shake the audience-chamber

of the soul, but a silent thought has power to move the soul itself. The waves rise and beat the unyielding shore; the impassable walls of the ocean remain, but the angry billows fall, recede, and disappear. In like manner do great facts and principles resist the elements of passion and prejudice through all ages. [Like bold promontories, from which we look out above life's troubled sea, they are left unmoved when the elemental strife is over."

An Essay on Musical Instruments. By JAMES H. NOËL. *Brochure.* 8vo, pp. 87. London, 1872.

IF legitimate fame had a tendency to render those who attain it haughty and overbearing, none should be more so than the Steinways, since it is impossible to take up the smallest pamphlet, or the largest volume, whose subject is partly or wholly musical instruments, and whose author or compiler is qualified for his task and free from bias, without finding that it awards the palm of superior excellence to the pianos of those gentlemen. But it is only spurious fame that has any such effect. The contrast is forcibly illustrated in the case of the Steinways. If any change has been produced in their bearing towards those who have intercourse with them, whether in business or social life, by the fact that their instruments are the favorites of princesses, queens, and empresses, as well as of the most eminent composers and artists, it is a change for the better—instead of making them stiff or rude it renders them more and more affable, polite, and conciliatory.

Among all our manufacturers, those who rank next to the Steinways in well-earned fame are, undoubtedly, the Chickerings of Boston. This fact, also, is acknowledged in the pamphlet before us. But the latter manufacturers find competitors in Knabe & Co., of Baltimore, who, by the unquestionable excellence of their instruments, claim the second rank. There are many others who make high pretensions. Curiously enough, some do so on the ground of their nationality—because they belong to the same country that produced Schrœder, generally regarded as the inventor of the piano; while others rely mainly on calling themselves by the name of a great composer who flourished nearly a century ago. But so true is it that the Steinways need no name but their own to give their instruments the *fiat* of superior excellence, that it would almost seem as if Schiller had intended to apply to them those lines in his "Song of the bell"* in which he sings of the combined effects of tenderness, strength, gentleness, harmony and sweetness:

> "Denn, wo das Strenge mit dem Zarten,
> Wo Starkes sich und Mildes paarten,
> Da gibt es einen guten Klang."

APPENDIX—INSURANCE TRACTS; BIBLE TRACTS; CLOAKS; RESULTS.

Winston's March and Counter-March, Various Insurance Documents, Newspaper Articles, etc., etc.

THERE has been but little change in Life Insurance since our last, but that little has been for the better. Before Mr. Winston commenced his recent performance, the business had undoubtedly begun to recover its prestige of former years. At the outset the course of that functionary had the effect of renewing former suspicions and fears; but this feeling did not continue many days. He found that his boasted control of the daily press, if it ever existed, had failed him at the critical moment. It seems he was quite astonished to learn that there are at least one or two journals, which, with all his wealth—his enormous percentages, bonuses, etc., he could not buy when he was in most need of their aid. These, instead of advocating his new plan, have denounced it pretty much as we had ourselves denounced several of his old plans. They have told a part of the truth, but although only a part—a small part—it is likely to prove sufficient to convince the intelligent portion of the policy-holders of the Mutual Life, as well as the outside public, that the financial morals of Mr. Winston have improved but little, if any, since he was accused by certain of his creditors of having failed in business only for a particular purpose.

Our readers may remember how often we have remarked, these twelve years past, that to fail in the dry goods business, or any other, without satisfying one's creditors, is not the right way to graduate or qualify for the profession of a life underwriter. Many a time we have asked whether such graduation or qualification is a satisfactory guarantee for the widow and the orphan. At the same time we did not allow that circumstance to exercise any undue influence on our estimate of Mr. Winston's character as an underwriter. To this day we do not know whether he took much or little from his dry goods creditors, for we have never made it our business to inquire into the private affairs of any one. Further than that we could not have much confidence in the philanthropy or integrity of one having the reputation of not possessing either, we have judged Mr. Winston only by his dust-throwing schemes. It is true that we have found most of these strictly consistent with the alleged financial and moral obliquity of that gentleman, as a dry-goods man, or dealer in "soft wares."

---

* *Das Lied von der Glocke.*

Had all our underwriters commenced their insurance career with a taint on their escutcheon such as that on Mr. Winston's, then there would have been no reason why we should not regard that gentleman's claim to public confidence as equal, if not superior, to that of any of his rivals. But, although there are underwriters whom we place far below Mr. Winston in the moral scale—underwriters whom we have always regarded as no better than common sharpers—we have never denied that among the underwriting fraternity in this country are to be found men who would do honor by their integrity and straightforwardness to any profession, however exalted. We should be slanderers and falsifiers, rather than faithful critics, did we deny that there are men who have entered the insurance profession with an unsullied reputation, and who have maintained that reputation without spot or blemish to this day. Nay, indeed, none have been more glad than we to bear testimony to the fact that we have sufficient companies managed by officers of this character to insure every citizen and adopted citizen of the whole United States. And in accordance with this feeling, we have sought to impress on our readers that the failure of so many English life companies is no reason why any of our principal American companies should also fail. We have tried to show that only those American companies that are similar to the defunct English companies should be regarded as likely to become defunct in turn. Moreover, we have not only indicated a considerable number of such, but predicted their fall. Several have fallen accordingly; and the rest of the spurious brood are but tottering to their fall.

We have still remaining more solid, enduring, faithful American companies than there are English companies of the same character; not because integrity and love of fair dealing, as well as money, do not abound in England quite as much as they do in this country. Only the most short-sighted and narrow-minded regard the relative standing of the American and English life companies as a national question. Intelligent Englishmen, as well as Americans, who have given any careful attention to the subject, understand that the reason of the difference is, that very different classses of men have, from the beginning, devoted themselves to Life Insurance in the two countries. English writers of the first class, far from concealing or denying that England has been unfortunate in this respect, have made the fact evident to the world. Douglas Jerrold, Thackeray and Hood, have in turn hurled their most powerful shafts of ridicule and scorn, through Punch and other similar journals, at the class of their countrymen who pretended to insure the lives of their fellow-subjects. And some of the fiercest and most indignant efforts of the London Times have been directed against the same tribe of organized sharpers. That Dickens has not overlooked them, all acquainted with his Martin Chuzzlewit are aware. The picture which the great novelist has drawn of "The Anglo-Bengalee Disinterested Loan and Life Insurance Company," has been justly regarded as the type of a large class. True, not one of the assailants of those widow and orphan protectors escaped the charge of being actuated by spite and malice; there is scarcely one of the numerous brood which have since become extinct, that did not accuse even Dickens of being actuated solely by base, selfish motives, in making "attacks" on such worthy, high-minded people!

But it may be asked: If those who introduced life insurance into the United States were a higher class, socially and morally, than those who introduced it in England, does not the fact seem to exculpate Mr. Winston from those imputations on his character, since the Mutual Life is one of the oldest of our life companies? It may, indeed, seem to do so, but it requires little reflection to see that in reality it does nothing of the kind. However, with the dishonesty or honesty of Mr. Winston before he became an underwriter, we have nothing to do. Nor have we ever denied that he possesses a certain sort of cleverness. As we have regarded Mr. Barnum, the great showman, as a "smart" man, so have we regarded Mr. Winston as smart. But if Barnum was successful in inducing larger numbers to visit his show than any other showman, we never thought for a moment that it was because he was more honest than others of the show fraternity. In fact, we have been ill-natured enough to think that it was, on the contrary, because he was more dishonest; at least because he had less regard for truth—because he could call a lobster an alligator, or a porpoise a mermaid, with less scruple than the most unscrupulous of his rivals. We may have reasoned very illogically, but we confess we have always regarded whatever success Mr.

Winston has accomplished in disposing of the policies of the Mutual Life, and enriching himself and his family, as the result of just such talents as those of Mr. Barnum.

If Mr. Winston has not succeeded so well lately as he did formerly, but has rather lost ground, there are good reasons for it. For some time, first, he had the Insurance field almost exclusively to himself, and the few companies established soon after the Mutual Life were conducted by men who would prefer never to succeed rather than do so by misrepresentation and charlatanism. A few remarks will sufficiently illustrate this:—The Mutual Life commenced businessin 1843. One year later the New England Mutual commenced business. No two men could be more different from each other than Mr. Winston, president of the Mutual Life, and Judge Phillips, president of the New England Mutual. One had attained distinction in law and literature, and brought to his new profession an unblemished character. What the other had distinguished himself in, and what sort of a character he had brought to his new profession, are things already discussed, though, perhaps, erroneously.

In 1845, the Mutual Benefit commenced business. This company was also organized by men whose reputation for fair dealing was intact. Its chief manager was Mr. Grover, the same gentleman who is still its president, and whose integrity has never been questioned. The New York Life commenced the same year the Mutual Benefit did; and it should be remembered that it was not until lately that the former began to deviate from the straight path. Although Mr. Franklin was not a jurist like Mr. Phillips or Mr. Grover, but had derived his chief distinction from having been an alderman when aldermen were not expected to possess either much intelligence or much honor, his character was good, and he pursued a straightforward course for many years as president of the New York Life—in fact, as long as he was permitted by his colleagues to do so.

Five years later (1850), several companies were established by men of the same stamp in integrity and sense of honor as Phillips and Grover; these were the Manhattan, the United States, the Ætna, and the Charter Oak, the president of the last-mentioned being, also, an exemplary member of the bar. Then only one year intervened between the organization of these four companies and that of the Phœnix Mutual, which was established under the auspices of men who had no superiors anywhere in their prestige for honesty and good faith.

There was but little discussion of life insurance in, this country, up to this time—no criticism. If there were a few of those willing to insure their lives who had heard those ugly stories about Mr. Winston's "soft-ware" performances, it was not difficult to convince them that those stories were "all spite," for the high character of the other underwriters we have mentioned served as a mantle for the alleged peccadilloes of that gentleman. And no one knew better than Mr. Winston how to use such a mantle. As those who help themselves to the woollen, cotton, or silk mantles of their unsuspicious neighbors, sometimes show their gratitude to the owners only by abusing them, so did the president of the Mutual Life abuse those whose mantle he used—the same as rat-catchers bait their traps with the best cheese, or roast beef.

While insurance matters were thus easily managed, Mr. Winston was a capital manager. The managers of the other companies mentioned scorned to adopt his plans; they also scorned to enter into controversies with one who would avail himself of such. They preferred to sell ten policies in a legitimate way, rather than to sell a hundred policies in an illegitimate way; in other words, they preferred to add a thousand dollars to their assets in a straightforward way than to add ten thousand to them in a crooked way. Winston laughed at this; he also grew fat and feathered his nest, while the policy-holders of the Mutual Life multiplied.

But a class of underwriters now enter the field, who, while not less honest than those with whom, only, Mr. Winston had hitherto to compete, were more disposed to propose questions and expose fallacies. The first that took a decided stand against the Barnum plan was the Equitable, organized in 1869. True, the Knickerbocker, which commenced business in 1853, had done good work before this. But Mr. Hyde, of the Equitable, was the first underwriter to take the Mutual bull by the horns; or, as some will have it, he was the first to take the Mutual donkey by the ears and show that he was but a donkey, and not the lion which he tried to simulate by the tremendous noise he made. Mr. Hyde did not do his work the less effectually because he smiled, and slapped Winston on the back, while he continued to spoil bubble after bubble. Mr. Jones, of the New York National, gave some hard blows in the same quiet way. Nor must we deny that Mr. Morgan, of the the North America, is entitled to no little credit for his share in the work of pricking Winston bubbles. We might mention several others who have taken a hand, more or less slyly, at the same useful process, together with Mr. Burns, of the Phœnix Mutual, Mr. Endors of the Ætna, Mr. De Witt, of the United

States, and poor Mr. Lawrence of the New York Continental, now, alas! no more. But enough for the present. What our own part in the good work has been, we leave it to our readers to say, contenting ourselves with the remark, that we have scarcely issued a number of our journal, for ten years past, in which we did not try to put the policy-holders of the Mutual Life on their guard against certain contingencies, some of which are now but too fully realized.

Thus, for years, Mr. Winston profited at once by his own fallacious plans, and by the straightforward plans of his only competitors. It was during this time, and under these circumstances, the great structure was built high in air. But no sooner is the architect put to the test of science—no sooner are the laws of gravitation brought to bear upon him—no sooner does the chemist begin to show that most, if not all, of his gold is but brass or pot-metal, than he is obliged to have recourse to various contrivances. The examinations of the affairs of the company by persons who, it was well known, would examine them in a "satisfactory" way, are still fresh in the minds of our readers; and so are the ponderous books, compiled at immense expense from the proceedings, and distributed among the faithful as convincing proofs that the whitewashing process had been thoroughly performed. We gave our impressions of each contrivance in full as soon as it was developed; nor did we fail to predict that Prof. Bartlett would be suitably rewarded for the important aid he gave in arranging the figures so satisfactorily for the last book. Some were surprised at seeing that gentleman receive the appointment of Actuary of the Mutual Life so soon after he had pronounced the figures of that institution "all right." We confess, we thought the proceeding rather queer ourselves; but the only part of it that surprized us was that played by the mathematician. We had expected better from a scientific man, although we had never regarded the science of Prof. Bartlett as either very profound or very reliable. At all events, we remarked at the time that it was not merely gratitude real or spurious that induced Mr. Winston to secure the permanent services of Prof. Bartlett. We told our readers it would not be very long before that gentleman would be called upon to make another discovery, since, under the most favorable circumstances, the process in which he had taken so distinguished a part could, huge as it was, only have a temporary effect. We did not pretend to know what would be the precise nature of his next discovery, but the world knows now what a brilliant thing—how much like the quadrature of the circle!

But these are not the only contrivances to which Mr. Winston has had recourse for the purpose of proving to the world, that, notwithstanding the "soft-ware" stories, and all other stories equally unfavorable, he is the man for the widow and the orphan! It is now ten or eleven years since we informed our readers that Mr. Winston had all of a sudden become very pious, and a prominent member of the Bible Society. Hitherto the widow and orphan were his chief care; now his solicitude for the souls of the heathen in Caffraria, and other remote regions, was still greater if possible! Then who could any longer doubt the honesty of Mr. Winston? Was there anybody whose thoughts were so depraved that he could question for a moment the integrity of a vice-president of the Bible Society—one who was, *ex officio*, a "first class manager," and who talked louder and longer at every meeting of the Board, about sending off Bibles and tracts, than anybody else? It was doubtless very uncharitable on our part to think and say at the time that this new piety and philanthropy were not the genuine articles. And well were we abused for it accordingly by the insurance press. At this time the Bible Society was, indeed, an honorable body, and one that did much good both at home and abroad; but we did not hesitate to predict, as our readers may remember, that since the money of Mr. Winston secured for him a controlling influence in its councils, it could not maintain its honorable character very long. We confess we became all the more convinced of this when we learned that one of the colleagues of Mr. Winston was the person who had made several visits to our office to bribe us with beer money to eulogize a certain institution with which he was connected in a very exalted capacity, and who, failing in this, threatened to set at us "the editors of all our leading papers"—those gentlemen being, as he assured us, already prepared for the work—in the event of our own making any "attack." * True, we were not crushed, or in any manner hurt by the "leading editors," after all. Whether it was that our "executive" friend relented, or that the "leading editors" refused to do the work prescribed for them, no more "leading" editors than the insurance editors have ever set upon us with any worse weapons than kind and encouraging words. Nay, it is but just to say, that, even of the insurance editors, none having any claims to be considered educated men, or gentlemen, have ever set upon us in any different way. No doubt, however, Mr. Winston secured some premiums by becoming vice-president and *ex-*

---

* *Vide* N. Q. R., No. XXXVII, Art. Vassar College and its Degrees.

officio "first-class manager" of the Bible Society; nor need it be doubted that the Bible Society made some money by the same transaction. Upon the whole, it may be said that Winston has gained by his connection with the Bible Society. Whatever money he paid to secure his position as leading manager was probably well laid out, considered in a business way. Nor have his numerous speeches, in favor of evangelizing the heathen proved by any means unprofitable to himself; they have doubtless served his purpose quite as well as his periodical abusive fulminations against the most unswerving and most honorable of his competitors!

The cloak afforded by the Bible Society has, like former cloaks, ceased to be of much value to the great insurer; but the party most injured by the connection of Mutual Life insurance and the Bible and tract business is, undoubtedly, the Bible Society. It gives us sincere pain to say, that that once honorable and useful organization is as much fallen at this moment, in the moral scale, as the Tammany Society was when we exhibited the great Ring-Leader to public derision and scorn. What, for example, did the Tammany Ring do—what could it have done—more disgraceful than to keep in its service, as a high "officer," a person capable of forcing his way into a private office, on which there is not a penny due, against a lady who is attending to her business in peace and silence, interfering with none, and who not only forbids his entrance and protests against it, but uses all the strength she possesses to prevent his opening the door; an effort in which she is aided by her errand-boy (placed outside to inform those who might want to see her husband that he is not at home), so far as a lad of ten or twelve years could afford her aid or protection; the only pretext for such cowardly brutality being that she is giving some food to her pet dog—an animal much better trained, and much more intelligent in his way, than the person who acted thus. It is needless to say that the lowest tenement house bully could hardly have been guilty of baser conduct.

True, the Bible Society, like any other corporation, however pious or good, is liable to receive into its service a person who may prove to be unfit for his position. Accordingly, no imputation is cast on the Society until the affair has been duly reported to the proper (?) authorities, and treated, so far as any redress, explanation, or apology is concerned, as a proceeding entirely proper and worthy of the Bible Society! Now, whether first-class manager Winston, and one or two other chief managers like him, had anything to do with bringing about this state of things in the Bible Society—whether they had anything to do with this very proceeding—let our readers judge. For our part, all the circumstances convince us that they certainly had. We were the more easily forced to this conclusion from the fact that the secretary of the society, who is a clergyman, and the president, who resides at Philadelphia, and has charge of Girard College, expressed, respectively, their deep regret and mortification; but added that they were utterly powerless in regard to it, except so far as to place it before the board of managers—that is, before F. S. Winston, Nathan Bishop, etc. Need we say, that we had just as much confidenee in this tribunal as we had in that composed of Peter B. Sweeny, A. Oakey Hall & Co., after his Honor had let his celebrated, but rather unfortunate, "cat out of the bag?"

When demoralization and degeneracy supervene in any institution, there are always certain evidences of the fact which cannot be concealed. It may be that only those having something to do with making criticisms on "first-class managers" are insulted and attempted to be blackmailed at the Bible House. But this will not account for the fact, which any one can verify for himself, that even in the depth of winter people withdraw from the Bible House as from a sinking ship or plague-spot, so that every entrance has to be placarded with the announcement, "offices to let." It is true that those attracted by this display may find reason enough for it, without supposing that there is anyone there who would bully a defenceless lady, or who would demand ten dollars bonus, apart from the rent! If their olfactories have not lost much of their natural sensibility, they have only to go upstairs and walk about a little. They need hardly use their eyes to be convinced that there ought to be some tracts on the uses of chloride of lime and carbolic acid, as well as on hypocrisy, imposture, etc. Closing this little episode, we return to the main branch of our subject.

Referring to the unfortunate "cat" of the *Hon.* A. Oakey Hall, reminds us that Mr. Winston, too, has let out his cat. He thought (just as Oakey did) that the animal would spare himself and his "high-minded" colleagues, and only hurt those who attempted to throw obstacles in the way of so pious and charitable a man. It is pretty evident already that this was a grave mistake, although only one or two of its ominous results have yet begun to develop themselves.

We might mention several other cloaks of which Mr. Winston has sought to avail himself, from time to time, including that of the Board of Charities and Correction; but there is not one of them which is not now very much the worse for the wear, if not altogether used up, like the Bible cloak. Few, if any of our readers, have failed to see the numerously signed, indignant protest of the policy-holders of the Mutual Life against Winston's latest scheme, since it has been published day after day in all our leading newspapers. None can deny that these numerous protesters include the most intelligent of the policy-holders, and those least disposed to find fault without good reason. But not only have large numbers voluntarily signed the sentence of condemnation, so unequivocally passed on Winston and his ring, a considerable number have accused them individually. In illustration of this we need only refer to the charges of Mr. James W. McCulloch, of No. 60 Beaver street, New York, which appeared in the Herald of December 17, 1872. After referring to the general protest of the policy-holders, Mr. McCulloch proceeds:

> "It has been said with much truth that 'one of the greatest dangers connected with the management of life insurance companies in this country has been immunity from criticism on the part of policy holders.' This arises in no small degree from the fact that the influence of these wealthy corporations has become so powerful and widespread that most policy-holders shrink from incurring the hostility which adverse criticism inevitably arouses, and acquiesce in or submit to that which they would otherwise unhesitatingly condemn and oppose. Furthermore, those *upon whom such criticism bears*, are ever ready to torture it into *an attack upon the business principles and cash interests involved in life insurance*, and thereby to alarm the policy-holder and *divert his attention from their own misdeeds*. None understand this *mode of defence* better or can use it more adroitly than the chief officer of the Mutual Life."

We need not ask those of the policy-holders, who read our journal, how often, these ten years past, have we sought to impress these facts upon them, and upon all intending to avail themselves of true insurance as a provision for their surviving families. But, limited as our space is in this department, we will let Mr. McCulloch tell sufficient of the story in his own way:

> "Two years ago, when an effort was made to arouse you to a just appreciation of *the infidelity of the officers* of the Mutual Life, corruptible men controlled the State offices, and the public feeling had not yet ripened; but the spirit of reform has been so awakened by the disclosures of corruption in high places, and of the evils which have wielded such baneful influence in matters of public trust, that I believe your minds are *now disposed for the reception of the truth with regard to some of those who have controlled the affairs of the Mutual Life*, and that you will unite in every proper effort to *eliminate* from *that management* everything that tends to endanger its safety or to impair its fair fame and credit
>
> "In a previous letter I gave you in brief some of the *well-established facts inculpating the officers in transacsions inconsistent with fidelity and morality, and can give you more.* I can show you how *applications were altered* by members of President Winston's family to *secure brokerages they had not earned;* how a lunatic

brother-in-law of Vice President McCurdy was placed in a most lucrative agency of the company, and his employment continued and thousand of dollars paid for his *alleged services when he was actually confined in the Bloomingdale Lunatic Asylum;* how by a fiction of bookkeeping, millions of dollars previously credited as income in the books of the company were again included as 'actual cash' receipts of subsequent years, to effect the apparent ratio of expenses of the company, and of other acts but, my present object is to show you by a few brief examples how the trustees have dealt with these transactions, to enable you to determine for yourselves how far you may safely rely upon the trustees to correct similar abuses.

"I have told you of the $30,000 loan to a trustee and the *false statement resorted to by President Winston* to conceal it from the Finance Committee. The committee of trustees appointed to inquire into that transaction were Lucius Robinson, Alexander Bradford, John Wadsworth, David Hoadley and William Smith Brown. All of them signed the 'statement of the facts,' in which it is stated that when the $30,000 was returned 'the clerk making the weekly statement to the Finance Committee at first entered it separately as so much received for United States certificates. He subsequently, by *direction of the President*, *erased* the entry and placed the amount with the general statement of receipts from premiums.' Thus, by direction of the President, the clerk *falsified* the weekly statement, and yet with the fact so distinctly stated by themselves, all, save Mr. Brown, reported that 'in respect to the management of our affairs with integrity, fidelity and efficiency, the committee have found nothing to condemn and much to praise.' Mr. Brown found evidence of *intentional deception* and refused to join the others; and it will doubtless be surprising to all who knew the pre-eminent position in social and religious life which Mr. Hoadley has attained, that, with the evidence of *the utterance of a deliberate falsehood* by President Winston for the concealment of an improper transaction, he did not concur with Mr. Brown.

"With regard to the restoration of the policies on the life of President Winston's son, the testimony of Messrs. William Betts and William H. Popham—both honorable and truthful men—clearly shows that Vice-President McCurdy, partly by withholding and partly by misrepresenting the facts necessary to guide them in the proper performance of their duty, procured the passage of a resolution which accomplished a purpose entirely at variance with their understanding and donating *ten times the amount* that was intended. Yet, with the evidence that they were thus deliberately deceived by him, both acquiece in his retention in office. And with regard to this transaction Mr. Lucius Robinson, in a letter written and widely distributed by the officers after the truth was fully established with regard to their policies, states, 'as facts in the case,' that young Winston was compelled to abandon his policies from poverty and because 'he supposed his salary (only $2,750 at the highest point) would enable him to keep his policies up;' and that 'the Insurance Committee, finding that he had been forced to abandon his policies because we did not pay him a salary sufficient to support him, at once recommended the 'restoration of his policies upon payment of back dues and interest.' Now the testimony of the two members of the Insurance Committee above named shows that they acted upon no such information, and the records of the company show that instead of being paid 'only $2,750 at the highest' his salary had been $3.000 per annum, and was *continued to be paid after his death* in July until the end of the fiscal year on the 1st of February following, with 20 *per cent. additional*, and that on the 9th day of March preceding his death he was paid $3,750 'bonus' and that over $200 brokerages were paid him by the company in 1864 and 1865, which would have served to have kept his $5,000 policy alive. Furthermore, the accounts of his administrators show that they received August 16, 1866, from the 'Mutual Life Insurance Company, $3,727.95, amount of insurance on life of said F. M. Winston,' and which was not derived from the restored policies in question."

It was for alluding to performances like these, on the part of Winston and others like him (for there are still worse than he, if possible, among our widow and orphan protectors), that we used to be abused so much, years ago, by the insurance press, until it was found that we do not belong to the class who can be frightened by braying. We have now before us several of the insurance journals for December; but the only one that utters a word of condemnation against Winston or his Ring is the Insurance Times. Those requiring any further testimony are referred to that journal, with the assurance that they will find abundance of it in its pages, although the morality of it may be somewhat damaged by the fact that the world has the benefit of it only in accordance with the adage that, when a certain class of people fall out, honest people are apt to get their own, or at least to be told who stole the goose, who stole the sheep, etc., etc. Until about six months ago, Winston was, in every respect, a model man in the eyes of the Insurance Times; the perfections of all other underwriters were combined in him; so that it took a whole page in every number of that journal —sometimes several pages—to present a catalogue of his virtues. Who would dare then to tread on Winston's tail? Now, it is fully admitted that the more so dirty a tail is trodden upon, until there is none of it left but the jags, the better for the cause of insurance, if not for the cause of the heathen in those parts of Africa not yet explored! But is it not better to have made the discovery six months ago, than not to have made it at all, like the other insurance journals?

True, the same discovery was made years ago by the well-known explorer and scientist of the Baltimore Underwriter. Dr. Bombauch's was only seven years later than our own; but, somehow or other, our friend's hitherto excellent memory and equally good visual organs seem to have failed him of late! But may we not hope that he will soon recover the full use of both in their pristine, characteristic vigor, and claim the benefit of his discovery? We will make no opposition, even if he apply for a patent, although we readily admit that it is not the class of physicians to which he belongs that make such applications.

In the meantime, however, the Insurance Times is our candidate, of all the insurance papers, both for the honor and the profit of the thing; and we say, seriously and earnestly, that it deserves credit for having commenced even at the eleventh hour to assist in tearing the veil of hypocrisy from the face of the great Mokanna of Insurance. But while we still look out for Surgeon Bombauch's scalpel, may we not use the language of the original pious Mokanna's faithful historian:

"O Reason! who shall say what spells *renew*,
When least we look for it, thy *broken clew!*
Through what small *vistas* o'er the *darken'd brain*,
Thy intellectual day-dream *bursts again*;
And how, like forts, to which beleaguerers win
Unhoped-for entrance *through some friend within*,
One clear idea, wakened in the breast
By *memory's magic*, *lets in all the rest.*"

What our daily metropolitan journals have said of Winston's *last* scheme need not be mentioned here. Suffice it to say that, with one or two exceptions, all have denounced and condemned it as "empiricism and quackery." That is, all have evinced more faith in the views and theories of twelve underwriters, whose characters are unsullied, than in those of one underwriter and his colleagues, whose character seems to be considerably sullied. In other words, when a question of good faith and veracity arose between the officers of the Mutual Life on one side, and those of the Manhattan, the Equitable, the United States, the Continental, the National, the North America and the Guardian on the other, our leading journals did not hesitate to set aside the statements and pretensions of the former as entitled to no credit.

Now, let us see what has been the feeling among respectable underwriters elsewhere. We have already intimated that the chief Boston company never engages in controversies. What the New England Mutual was in its honorable prestige under the management of Judge Phillips, it is to-day under the management of Mr. Benjamin F. Stevens, who is now one of the two or three oldest underwriters in America, and who has no superior among underwriters anywhere in ability and intelligence. It is a significant fact that the only underwriter not belonging to the Mutual Life Ring who attempts to excuse Mr. Winston, bases his main argument on the fact that, although the New England Mutual insures at very moderate rates, it is nevertheless a prosperous company. Thus, among several letters from the secretaries of the leading Hartford companies, in the Hartford Courant of Dec. 14, we find one from Mr. S. H. White, of the Charter Oak, in which the following passage occurs:

> "One of the oldest life companies in the country has done a most successful business, but only of moderate amount on account of lack of effort, on very low rates, and has been able even upon them, by *its great care and economy, to make larger dividends to its policy-holders* than most of the high-rate companies *have ever reached.* That company was under the direct oversight of the Hon. Elizur Wright when he was insurance commissioner for Massachusetts, but *he never thought it necessary to warn its officers that their course was unwise or unsafe,* as he now does those of the Mutual Life."

This may seem very good logic to those who do not know the difference between Mr. Winston and Mr. Stevens, but to those who do it will seem the reverse. It is certainly no imputation on the judgment or integrity of Mr. Elizur Wright that "he never thought it necessary to warn its (the New New England Mutual's) officers that their course was unwise or unsafe." But for the opposite reason it would have been a very grave imputation both on his judgment and on his integrity to have failed to warn the policy-holders of the Mutual Life, As for warning the officers of the latter as long they could have proceeded with their schemes of self-aggrandizement, we fear he might as well have warned the wolf or the buzzard. Mr. White must not judge the motives of Mr. Wiuston by those of either Mr. Stevens or Mr. Walkley, except he wishes to give both the latter good reason to feel offended, and we entirely acquit him of any such intention.

But there is one other letter in the Courant of the above date from which we will extract a passage or two; we mean that of Mr. J. F. Burns, of the Phœnix Mutual. No one understands the principles of Life Insurance better than Mr. Burns, and that he is capable of discussing them lucidly and well will be seen presently. After alluding in general terms to Winston's last contrivance, the Secretary of the Phœnix Mutual proceeds:

"In a mutual company the entire members own it and every dollar of its assets as well as its surplus, and it must be apparent that no action should be taken by the managers of a mutual insurance company of a nature calculated to imperil the stability of the company, or to absorb its assets or surplus, without the consent fo at least a majority of the members, and so it comes to pass, that while the general uninsured public may desire to become, on cheap terms, members of the company, and so partake of its advantages as to security, the policy-holders whose money has built it up may feel that whatever be the merits or demerits of low rate plans of insurance, the surplus which is theirs should not be parcelled out for the benefit of the new comers. The *course of the Mutual Life is one full of inconsistencies, and time would fail to even refer to them all;* but it may be well to glance at a couple of them. Just exactly two months before the announcement of the change of rates, in a circular issued to its policy-holders, it said: 'The company will continue to guide its business in the future by the same principles and rules which a long experience has shown to be most conducive to the safety and best interests of its policy-holders. It will issue policies of all approved descriptions and at its usual table rates. How long did it so continue?

"If one point connected with insurance more than another has been kept prominent in the literature of the Mutual Life, it has been the claim that it has uniformly *furnished insurance as low as safety would admit of.* If we grant that it has, then why the necessity for a change at all? If a commodity is supplied to the public *as low as it can safely be done, it cannot be cheaper;* but it is claimed that the new system will be cheaper than the old, and this leads to the subject of rates and 'loading,' which means, briefly, that a certain amount is necessary to carry insurance on a single life because of the mortality at risk, and this amount is called the 'net rate,' and the "loading" is the amount added for expense, consisting of commission to agents, taxes, printing, salaries of officers, clerks, etc.; and the claim of the Mutual Life is, that a 'loading' of ten per cent. to the net rate is sufficient for all expenses. Now, the older a company is and the larger its business, the less is, or should be, the ratio of its expenses. How has it been with the Mutual Life (this the largest of large companies) with reference to expenses? The total expenses during the last twenty-eight years shows an average of 16 1-5 to the total premium receipts; but it is a well-known fact that even the Mutual Life cannot procure new business on commissions less than 25 per cent., and the alarmed policy-holder knows that the difference between the ten per cent. calculated for and the actual amount paid *must come out of the surplus fund of the company which he, in common with every other policy-holder, owns.*"

This, it will be admitted, is sound logic. Passing over only one paragraph, we make room for Mr. Barns's concluding remarks:

"The old and tried half credit plan of insurance will be *the plan* which will most successfully compete with the Mutual Life under the new arrangement, and the

> Phœnix Mutual Life has less to fear from the "low rate" crusade than any other company in Hartford. The old rates of the Mutual Life and the half note credit of the Phœnix Mutual Life do not differ materially, and while the new members of the former will have to pay 78 per cent. of the old rates, a man can insure his life in the latter by paying the first year 50 per cent., with interest on the other 50 per cent. in the shape of note, so that he pays the first year 53 per cent. where the man insured in the Mutual Life pays 78, and in the Phœnix Mutual the most which members have hitherto paid is 62 per cent. *in cash*, so that in point of fact the Phœnix Mutual has offered in the past, and hopes to in the future, insurance cheaper than that now proposed by the Mutual Life. The question naturally arises here how the Phœnix Mutal can supply insurance cheaper than the Mutual Life's proposed rates, do it safely and *yet claim that the plan of the Mutual Life is unsafe!* The reason is obvious. The notes given by members of the Phœnix Mutual Life form a *guarantee* fund, so to speak, and if not needed to be realized on can be *returned in whole* (as they had been hitherto) *or in part*, as the receipts of the company may dictate, and they can, in case of reverses by visitations of pestilence, or any other cause, be *relied on to meet deficiencies*. One principle in life insurance should not be lost sight of, and that is that if it be found that *policies of insurance are issued at rates higher than is required for perfect safety*, it is much easier, *safer and pleasanter* to return to the policy holder the surplus than to *invent machinery* to increase the premium if it should be found to be too low."

All the circumstances are now before our readers, and let them judge for themselves. Those so disposed may pass over the fact that for ten years past we, in every number of our journal, have been warning all interested in insurance against the peculiar "management" of the Mutual Life. They may also accept the various cloaks worn by Mr. Winston, as righteous cloaks, and deny that he has brought any disgrace on the Bible Society, or caused it to resemble the Tammany Ring in certain particulars. It is not necessary that any policy-holder should believe that the bully of the Bible Society is his protegé and tool. There is ample testimony without all this. The policy-holders, themselves, have, at last, furnished abundance.

At the same time we do not pretend to think that those wishing to avail themselves of life insurance, to make provision for their surviving families, need be deterred from doing so by the performances of Winston and his satellites. All they require now, as in the past, is to exercise some discrimination. We have often tried to show how real worth in insurance can be distinguished from its mimic semblance, and it will be found, by all who examine them, that our tests still hold good. In the meantime we expect to see Mr. Winston appear very soon in the new rôle of a reformer. Already he has some strong claims to be considered a worthy disciple of even so illustrious a philanthropist and patriot as Reformer Green; for our insurance Mokanna is very much misrepresented if, he too, is not considerably guided in his payments to widows and orphans by the new principle in political economy, no puff no pay, except forced pay, and the greater the puff the greater the pay!

THE

NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. LII.

MARCH, 1873.

ART. I.—1. *Examen critique de la Histoire de la Géographie du nouveau Continent.* HUMBOLDT. Paris.

2. *Ancient America in Notes on American Archæology.* By JNO. D. BALDWIN. New York.

3. *Historical and Geographical Notes on the Earliest Discoveries in America,* 1453-1530. By HENRY STEVENS, G. M. B., M. A., etc. 1869.

4. *Quatre Lettres sur le Mexique.* Par M. BRASSEUR de BOURBOURG. Paris. 1868.

"RECENTLY vast stores of material of American history have been brought to light. Old books and maps have turned up. Bibliography has become an exact science. Documents are scrutinized anew as they never were before. New historical books have been written, old ones revived, annotated, edited, and reproduced, to such an extent that half an American historian's labor, before he begins his narrative, consists in clearing away the rubbish of his predecessors, and in reconciling conflicting authorities."*

These remarks are applicable to the history of the old world as well as the new; but, in either case, the labors of the modern historian have as yet far from exhausted the existing known materials, and he may look forward to more labor with those which are likely to be added. The craving for true and exact history remains unsatisfied. History, of one kind or other, we have in abundance, and it is pouring forth from the press daily; but when we find writers disputing over events which have occurred in their own time, we may be excused from placing implicit reliance on their statements respecting those events which occurred ages ago.

---

* Stevens' *Notes*, p. 8.

Nevertheless, considerable light has been thrown upon the early history of this continent by the researches of modern investigators. Conspicuous among the latter is the Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg, who has extracted from the ancient Mexican records an elaborate narrative of the rise and extension of the primitive communities and kingdoms of Central America—an outline of which was given in the National Quarterly some time back. * It is to be hoped that some equally learned and indefatigable investigator will do the same with the ancient Peruvian records, as M. de Bourbourg has done with the Mexican. And the remote history of the so-called Indian tribes of this continent is a field of inquiry as yet only partially investigated. It is true that the United States Government, many years ago, employed Dr. Henry R. Schoolcraft to make researches in this direction, but the result has certainly been inadequate, considering the time and labor which that gentleman devoted to the subject, although his reports fill six bulky folio volumes.

The explorations of European navigators prior to Columbus are another very interesting field of research as yet unexhausted; but of late years some of the most eminent scientists have devoted considerable attention to it, and some very curious charts of the Atlantic coasts of this continent have been brought to general notice, fac-similes of which are given in Mr. Stevens' work. These specimens of mediæval art are

---

* *Successive Conquests and Races of Ancient Mexico.* **National Quarterly Review, No. XXXVI, March, 1869.**

also interesting as showing the condition of geographical knowledge, generally, in those days. It has hitherto been too much the fashion to begin with Columbus in treating of the history of America, as though there had been no navigators before him. But it may be doubted whether he would have done what he did had it not been for the previous attempts and failures of others. At all events, it is beginning to be now generally recognized, that the discovery of this continent dates back to a very remote period—far beyond even that of the Northmen, who came over here from Iceland at the beginning of the eleventh century. Even from distant China, in ancient times, came rumors of the existence of a great country beyond the Pacific, and these must have reached Europe in the course of the centuries during which traffic was open between Seres* or Sinæ, the Hindoos, the Arabs, and the Romans. It is known that the ancient Chinese recognized the American continent under the name of Fou Sang, a fact which has not been followed up, as regards Chinese intercourse therewith, as it might have been.† A closer examination of the Chinese records and literature might produce other allusions to this continent, and perhaps some intimations of communication with it. And if this be the case with China, *à fortiori* it is likely to be so with the records and literature of Japan, on account of the greater proximity of the latter country to our western shores, and also because it is possible for a ship to sail thence to any part of the American coast, east or west, *without losing sight of land*—a fact which we do not remember to have seen dwelt upon. If it be objected that there are six thousand miles of ocean between San Francisco and Yokohama, and that the ancient Japanese were not sufficiently skilful mariners to venture far to sea, out of sight of any landmark, we reply that they might cross over by taking the circuitous route of their own coasts to the Kurile Islands, and, past them, to Kamtschatka, thence to Behring Strait and Alaska, and so down our Pacific coast to South America, without losing sight of land all the way. And we have little doubt that this was done, although as yet no record of the exploit has been found. At all events, there is nothing improbable, or unreasonable, in the supposition that such a thing was done, and done more than once, too. In this way we may readily account for the existence of races on this continent like the Mound-builders, entirely distinct from the red men of the forest, improperly called Indians; and for the civilization, arts, and sciences of Mexico, before the Spanish conquest. The great Tartar warrior Kublai Khan, after he had subdued China (A. D. 1280), fitted out an expedition against Japan. It consisted of four thousand vessels, according to the accounts of Japanese,* and the ships were filled with the bravest and best warriors of Mongolia, Corea, and China; but they were dispersed near the Piscaderes, or the Pang-Hoo islands, in the channel of Formosa, in lat. 23°30′ north, and long. 119°30′ east of Greenwich, by violent storms; many of them were wrecked on the islands and on the coast of Formosa, many were driven out to sea and not heard of again, and the remainder returned to China. Is it improbable that some of these ships found their way across to the shores of Oregon or California? At all events it is somewhat singular that the first appearance of the Algonquins in these regions, a race of warriors until that time unknown to the natives, occurred about the time of Kublai's expedition (A. D. 1283), and they commenced their march westward soon after. They spoke a language unknown to the western tribes of red men, but akin to that of the Iroquois, who came of the same ancestors, and made their first appearance in the northwestern portion of this continent about the same time. These Algonquins, as the natives called them, advanced to the Mississippi, carrying on a fierce struggle with the Appalachian tribes, and if the surmise be correct that they were Mongolians and Chinese, it is possible that they were the constructors of the mounds and earth fortifications found in the Ohio Valley, and other places in the west. And this idea receives confirmation from the circumstance that the age of the trees found growing on the mounds (as counted by the rings in the stems) is between 500 and 600 years, which would carry back the time of their planting to this very period. The war was a long and bloody one—it was, in fact, one of extermination. The Algonquins fought their way northward, and, in conjunction with the Iroquois, drove the Appalachians and their allies—some of whom were *white* men—into Tennessee and Kentucky, and destroyed them there in such numbers as to obtain for the latter State the name of "the dark and bloody ground."* From that time down to the time of the colonization of it by the Americans and Europeans, no tribe of red men ever permanently dwelt there, the Cherokees and the Creeks, in particular, holding the very soil in abhorrence.

---

* Pliny speaks of the Seres and their silks. Lib. xxxiv. c. 14, and vi. c. 17.

† But see De Guignes in the *Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions*. Vol. xxviii. p. 503, and De Paravey's *L'Amerique sous le nom de Pays de Fou Sang*. Paris, 1844.

---

* Gutzlaff's *Sketch of Chinese History*, Vol. i. p 382.

The war between the Algonquins and the Appalachian and Alleghany tribes seems never to have ceased until quite modern times. On the first settlement of the country by Europeans, the tribes of the Iroquois and the Lenne-Lenapes were at war with the Cherokees, Muscogees, and the Southern Alleghany tribes in Carolina, who were, in their turn, hemming in the Tuscaroras, a branch of the Iroquois, with whom they subsequently (in the eighteenth century) united, and became one of the "six nations," in 1712. The Iroquois also took the Meherrins or Tutelas under their protection, and it is most probable that many other of the kindred tribes, of whom we find no particular account, retired westwardly in like manner, and were incorporated into one or other of the western tribes.†

To return to the question as to how far the old world was acquainted with the new, before the time of Columbus, Humboldt gives a summary of what was thought and believed by the ancients;‡ but they do not appear to have had any positive knowledge of the existence of the American continent; their ideas were speculations and surmises, not the least notable of them being that there was an underside to the world—an *antichthon;* and it was a subject of dispute among the early fathers of the Christian Church whether paradise was situated in the East or in the Antichthon.* With this, however, we are no further concerned at present than to show by it that the wise men of Europe, Asia, and Africa, did not know anything about America, but that they surmised there might be an inhabitable country at their antipodes. The only exception to these surmises may be that as to the existence of Atlantis, an island in the Atlantic, whose inhabitants in ancient times made war on the Athenians.† But the myth is so involved in mystery that it will not serve us as a guide.

---

* Alluded to in the article on Mexico, in National Quarterly Review. No. XXXVI, March, 1869.

† Jefferson, *Notes on Virginia*, p. 156. ‡ *Cosmos*, Vol. ii, pp. 63-99.

M. de Bourbourg, however, believes that in deciphering the Mexican hieroglyphics, he has discovered the true meaning of the fable of Atlantis, and the hidden meaning of the sacred books of that nation. In his *Quatre Lettres sur le Mexique,* he argues at great length that the continent of America once extended very far to the East, even to the Azores, and that in those days there was constant communication with Africa, Europe, and this continent; hence the legend of Atlantis has a historical basis. Moreover, he finds in the Mexican theology the same myths and fables which are contained in the Greek and the Egyptian. ‡ The whole of that portion of our continent, over which now roll the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean Sea, and the Atlantic Ocean (between the windward West India Islands and the Azores) was, according to him, submerged after a series of hideous eruptions of volcanos, earthquakes and whirlwinds, in which the greater portion of the inhabitants perished, a few only being saved in Cuba, Jamaica, Hayti and Porto Rico, which were previously the summits of lofty mountain ranges, as individual. smaller West India Islands were summits of single mountains, but which became islands when the continent on which they stood sank. He further contends that America formerly extended far to the West, into the Pacific, and was at one time within an easy distance of Eastern Asia, the Polynesian Islands being the remains of its mountain ranges. As changes are, and always have been, going on all over the earth's surface, some portions of its crust rising and others sinking, there is nothing improbable in M. de Bourbourg's theory; but whether he has established it as corroborated by recorded facts must be left to those learned in Mexican lore to decide. If this theory be correct, it raises the question—not now mooted for the first time—whether, in fact, the commonly received order of things ought not to be reversed, and this continent be recognized as the old world, and Asia as the new. The name of the first Asiatic man was Adam, which signifies "red earth"; was he of the same race as the primeval red men of this continent?

---

* *Cosmos.*

† Plato, *Timæus.* Humboldt, *Cosmos*, Vol. i, pp. 156–166.

‡ See particularly his fourth Letter.

The statement made by Rafu, the Limerick trader (so called from his residing at Limerick, in Ireland), in his account of Are Marson's voyage to this continent in the year 983, will, if it can be relied on, prove that there had long been intercourse between Ireland and the coasts of Virginia, Carolina, Georgia, and Florida; so much so, indeed, that that portion of our continent was named by the northmen *Irland it mikla*, or Great Ireland. Rafu says that Are Marson, a powerful Iceland chieftain, was driven thither by storms, and there *baptized*. Another account states that Are was recognized there, and not allowed to return to Iceland, but was held in high respect in Florida. These people, most probably, were Irish Christians, settled there previously, how long cannot now be ascertained: "They wore white dresses, used iron implements, and had poles borne before them, on which were fastened lappets, and who shouted with a loud voice." *

Sixteen years afterwards, the Norwegian, Gudleif Gudlangson, trading with Dublin, was driven by adverse winds to the coast of Florida, where he met with a countryman of his, named Biärn Asbrandson, who had been driven thither also by storms many years before, and had become a chieftain of authority among the natives.[*] In the year 1121, Eric, bishop of Greenland, went over to Massachusetts (then called Vinland), thus showing that intercourse was still kept up between these countries.[†] In 1266 an expedition for the exploration of the Artic regions was fitted out by the clergy of Greenland, and the regions explored in recent times by Parry, Ross, Franklin, Kane, and others, were examined.[‡] And in 1285, two Iceland clergymen, Adalbrand and Thorwald Helgason, discovered Newfoundland.[§] In 1347 a ship sailed from Greenland to Nova Scotia, then called Marteland, to bring back timber. The record of this voyage is presented in the archives of the Royal Historical Society of Copenhagen, translated from the Icelandic into Latin.[‖]

---

* *Antiquitates Americanæ*, p. xxxvii.

The foregoing details have been briefly noticed, to show that North America, or at all events its western shores, were known to, and frequently visited by the Northmen of Iceland and Norway, and by the Irish. We now come to the question, What was known and what can now be known of the state of the continent in those early times and prior to the so-called discovery of it by Columbus? And in considering this question we shall omit Mexico, because a continuous sketch of the history and social and political condition of that ancient empire has already been given in the National Quarterly.[¶]

What became of the Irish Christians of Florida? Did they die out? or were they exterminated by the natives? or did they intermarry with the latter and become absorbed by the more numerous race? No answer can be given to any one of these questions. Not a vestige of their habitations or monuments, if they had any, has ever been found. The Northmen who visited them say they spoke the Irish language, and were Christians, but they took no root in the land, and passed away as completely as though they had never existed. What vestiges have been left of the Northmen who visited Virginia, Massachusetts, Newfoundland, and Nova Scotia? Perhaps a few inscriptions, cut with iron implements upon rocks in unknown or doubtful characters, and hieroglyphics. Respecting these inscriptions, it may be observed that the Indians were ignorant of their existence, and also of the art of working with iron. They learned both from the English after the settlement of the country by the latter. The meaning of the inscriptions is matter of conjecture, and it is by no means certain that they were cut by the Northmen, although some antiquaries and learned men, who have closely examined them, have thought they had discovered Runic characters in them; while others have thought them to be of Phœnician origin. This was especially the case with the inscription on the block of granite found at the mouth of the river Taunton,* Massachusetts.

---

[*] *Antiquitates Americanæ.* [†] Ibid, p. xxxviii. [‡] Ibid, pp. xxxviii–ix.

[§] Ibid, p. ix. [‖] Ibid.

[¶] *Successive Conquests and Races of Ancient Mexico.* National Quarterly Review, No. XXXVI, March, 1869.

The truth is, however, that no satisfactory explanation of the history and meaning of these inscriptions has been given, and conjectures, however plausible, cannot be accepted as evidence. They are not much more authentic than the famous stone submitted by Mr. Pickwick to the Pickwick Club, with its mystic inscription, which was at first thought to be Roman, but on closer examination turned out to be cockney English. The wide extent of country in which these inscription rocks have been found is a strong argument *against* their being of Norse origin. They have been discovered in Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Georgia, Kentucky, and Western Pennsylvania, the two last-named States being too far inland to have been reached by the Northmen; the latter never claimed to have done more than explore the western coasts and the Arctic regions.

The discovery of a quantity of copper coins at Medford, Mass., in 1787, is another piece of evidence that that portion of the country had been visited by foreigners. The coins were found concealed under a flat stone, and were in quantity about two quarts. They bore no similitude to any known coins, nor could any work on numismatics throw light on their origin, though some Russian coins contain a figure resembling one that appeared on the face of them. The way in which our continent has been settled, the ruthless destruction of forests, the reckless clearing out of natural obstacles, the blasting of rocks, the digging of quarries, the building of houses, bridges, wharves, the cutting of roads and excavating for railroads, all with a view to immediate profit, have caused many objects of interest to the historian and the archæologist to disappear. This has been particularly the case in Rhode Island. Mr. Webb, secretary to the Rhode Island Historical Society, in a letter to the Royal Antiquarian Society of Copenhagen, dated 30th November, 1834, says: "In our former communication we stated that an Inscription Rock was said to have been on Gardiner's Point, and also one in Tiverton. I have marked a spot with India ink on the chart at each of those places in reference to the tradition, although none such have been found by us. The one in Tiverton, we have marked near Howland's Ferry Bridge, because we apprehend that this *shared the fate common to all rocks in that vicinity for some distance round*, when the last bridge was built at that place in 1809, which was constructed by *dropping immense quantities of stones of all dimensions into the water* till a rampart was raised above the surface of the highest side. The water here at the lowest tide is fifty-one feet." *

---

* Yates & Moulton. *Hist. of State of New York*, p. 86.

This wholesale appropriation of the materials nearest at hand for building purposes has not been peculiar to the people of Rhode Island. It has prevailed wherever men of European extraction have settled, and at the present day no American engineer, in laying out a railroad or canal, would hesitate a moment to cut through any one of the great mounds of Ohio if it lay in his way; no "venerable oaks" are safe from the axe of the woodman or the builder; nor are ancient intramural cemeteries respected when it is desired to lay out a new street. The sentiment of veneration for antiquity has yet to take root in the American character.

---

* *Antiquitates Americanæ*, p. 372.

Dr. Schoolcraft believed that traces of Prince Madoc's expedition to this continent had been found near Wheeling in Western Virginia. Madoc was a son of Owen Gwyneth, a king of Wales. In the year 1170, he made a voyage across the Atlantic with a number of followers, and founded a colony somewhere on this continent. He seems to have been so well satisfied with the locality that he returned to Wales for more colonists, and persuaded ten ship-loads of his countrymen to accompany him to his new settlement here. They sailed from Wales and were never heard of more. "The story of Madoc," says Schoolcraft,* "is an almost unexampled problem in American history, having never been scrutinized by the lights of philology, and the careful investigation of the monuments of distinctive intrusion, which exist. That the ancient Celtic character has been found in Western Virginia, appears incontestable. These evidences were first announced in 1838." A small, thin, flat, oval stone was discovered bearing on it characters of an apparently alphabetical value. The discovery was communicated to the Royal Society of Antiquaries, of Copenhagen, in 1841, and Professor Rask was disposed to think it of Celtiberian origin."† It was thought by the Romans that the British tribe of the Silures, who inhabited South Wales, were descendants of the Iberians of Spain.‡ But notwithstanding the positive manner in which Dr. Schoolcraft speaks of the discovery of Celtic characters on the stone alluded to, the evidence which he adduces in support of it is but slight.§ There was a large oak standing on the top of the mound within which the stone was found. The cortical layers of this oak were counted in order to ascertain its age, but there was serious disagreement as to the number, Mr. Clemens estimating them at 300,‖ and Mr. Tomlinson at 500.¶ This is a point of great importance, making all the difference between the year 1338 and 1538, which latter date is 46 years after the discovery of the continent by Columbus. We say *discovery*, but it is a mere *façon de parler*, for Columbus did not, properly speaking, *discover* America; he *stumbled upon it* in his search for a western route to India. But neither number carries the date back to 1170.

---

* Schoolcraft's *Ethnological Researches*, Vol. v. p 34.

† *Vide* the Society's *Memoirs*, 1840, 1843, p 135.

‡ Tacitus.

§ *Ethnol Res.*, Vol. i. p 120.

‖ *Trans. Am. Ethnol. Soc.* Vol. i.

¶ *Am. Pioneer*, p. 199.

Nor is it clear that the Scandinavians considered America a new continent, or that they verified any geographical theory by their bold voyages. It is certain that their primitive maps of the bays of New York, Delaware, and Chesapeake, as published at Copenhagen, bear a name that is translated *Great Island.* Their exploits attracted attention at home, and the fame of them reached other parts of Europe. It is known, moreover, that Columbus himself had been attracted by them, and that he visited Iceland for the purpose of verifying what he had heard, and increasing the sum of facts on which his theory was based. We applaud him because he meant to make a discovery, and not for his accidental finding of this continent. The reason for giving it the name of "Great Island" has been already stated. The aborigines seem to have no other name for it than "the Great Island," and their prevalent tradition was that it rose out of the "big waters," or ocean; also that plants and animals were created before man; and that after the creation of the first human tribe, "the Eagwehoewe people," some of them became giants. In their traditions there are many points of resemblance to Genesis; and the ancient Zoaroastrian doctrine, of a good principle and an evil one ruling the world, but in perpetual antagonism to each other, was also held by them. Probably this was the natural and unavoidable belief of all nations which had not attained to any high intellectual development. They would perceive the existence of good and evil, but, being unable to explain why evil should exist in defiance of the good principle, they concluded that it must be coëqual and coëternal with its antagonist.

There are other religious features which prevail among some of the Indian tribes that indicate their Asiatic origin. Such is the practice of cutting their arms and legs to denote sorrow for the dead, as was customary among the Phœnicians and Carthagenians, the Canaanites and Syrians. Then there was the worship of the sun, though this was but faintly developed among the northern tribes. It prevailed chiefly among the Mexicans, the Toltecs, and the Aztecs, and in Central and South America. The red men of the forest were believers in the immortality of the soul and its reunion with the body; they also believed that their favorite animals would be with them in the happy hunting-grounds of the next world. And, like the Hindoos and Chinese, they worshipped the spirits of their ancestors, placed cakes on their graves, and, like the Greeks, poured out libations. A Hebraic origin has been attributed to the aborigines of America, according to the theory which derives all mankind from the descendants of Noah, specified in the tenth chapter of Genesis. And the attempt has been made to establish this origin by tracing out resemblances to the Hebrews, in the sound, orthography, and definition of words in the aboriginal languages, but it does not appear that these resemblances are sufficient to be conclusive evidence on the point. This Hebraic theory is as yet in a conjectural state.*

Having now examined all the traditions of ths ante-Columbian visits of foreigners to this country, we will turn to the Indians themselves, in order to ascertain what their condition was at the time of the arrival of the Spaniards, and what traces remain of their ancient history. The latter task is one resembling the process known as "looking for a needle in a haystack," but the search after truth is its own reward to the inquiring mind. At the close of the fifteenth century, this continent was inhabited by the Mexicans, south of the Rio Grande, who were ruled by the conquering Aztecs; the empire of the latter extending into California and Arizona. Over the northern portion of the continent, from the Rio Grande to the Arctic regions, roved wild tribes of red men, who subsisted mainly by hunting. It is a mistake to suppose that they were all settled communities, in the civilized sense of the term. When a tribe had exhausted one hunting-ground, they removed to another, and if they encountered another tribe bent on the same errand, they fought until one or the other was exterminated or driven away. And although we meet with chiefs who called themselves kings, as Powhattan did in Virginia, and Massasoit in Massachusetts, their governing power was a rope of sand, obeyed only by their "braves" or camp-followers when it suited them.

---

* The subject of the religion of the red men was fully treated in an article in the National Quarterly Review, No. XIII, June, 1863, under the heading, "Theology of the American Indians."

There was a great variety of tribes. Every great valley, lake, or mountain-range had its separate tribe, although the languages they spoke, when closely examined, proved them to be only dialects of a few parent stocks. In all the range of the North Atlantic, there were not over three or four generic stocks, and apparently not more than seven in the entire area east of the Mississippi. These were the Algonquins, Iroquois, Appalachians, Cherokees, Utchees, and Natchez or Chigantualguas.* The Algonquins and their affiliated tribes occupied the littoral districts from the St. Lawrence to Pamlico Sound, but of these tribes which extended over the Carolinas, not a soul is now known to be living. The first English and French settlers found Algonquin tribes around the lakes, on the banks of the Illinois and Wabash, and as far as the mouth of the Ohio. Into this great Algonquin circle a group of tribes speaking a different language intruded themselves shortly before the settlement of the Dutch on Manhattan Island. They called themselves Iroquois and "the Five Nations" (afterwards six by admitting the Tuscaroras among them) and took possession of Western New York. They at first cultivated maize, but, being supplied by the Dutch with fire-arms, they extended their possessions as far west as the Illinois, and as far north as Montreal. Their origin, before alluded to as possibly Mongolian, is uncertain; they have affinity with the Wyandots of the West, and with some of the New Mexico and Utah tribes.

West of the Mississippi were the Sioux or Dacota tribes, embracing the Iowas, Omahas, Otoes, Missouris, Osages, Kansas, Quappas and the circle of the prairie tribes. In the South were the Utchees, the Muscogees or Creeks, Choctaws, Chickasaws and Seminoles, inhabiting the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Florida. This group had come from the west and driven out the prior occupants, who were of the Algonquin and Iroquois groups. The Seminoles occupied Florida; the Choctaws occupied the northern coast of the Gulf of Mexico, and the lands thence to the Mississippi. The Cherokees inhabited a secluded territory lying at the end of the Appalachian chain, but not extending to the Atlantic, the Gulf of Mexico, or the Mississippi; and at this period the Cumberland river was called the Cherokee. The Natchez occupied a position on the Mississippi, from the Red River to the Yazoo; they were descendants of the Toltecs; north of them were the Chickasaws, in Tennessee and Kentucky; but the latter was a neutral war-ground, and was subsequently occupied by the Shawnees, an Algonquin tribe.

---

* Schoolcraft, *Introductory*, pt. VI, p. 81.

The Algonquins, before the Spanish conquest, were the most powerful and numerous race of red men on the Northern Continent. They were divided into many tribes and spread over what are now the Middle and New England States, from the Mississippi to the Atlantic. They included the Shawnees, Kaskaskias, Illinois, Chippewas, Ottawas, Pottawattamies, Miamies, Kelistenos, Crees, Blackfeet, Blood Indians, Mushkeags, and kindred tribes. But there was no confederation among them, and they frequently made war on each other. Hence they fell before the more vigorous and better organized tribes of the Iroquois, who were the most remarkable of all the red men of America.

The Iroquois or Five Nations (as their name denotes) formed a vast confederacy, without any superiority of one nation over another. "This Union," says Colden,* "has continued so long that the Christians know nothing of the origin of it." The first English and Dutch explorers found it existing, as did the first French settlers in Canada. The Five Nations composing it were the Mohawks, the Oneidas, the Onondagas, the Cayugas, and the Senecas. Each of these nations was an absolute republic in itself, governed by its sachems or old men, who, in fact, held no other authority than what was based upon the respect and confidence of the people. They could not enforce any decree. The leaders in war were similarly situated: they were obeyed only so long as their followers had confidence in them.* Yet we find this confederacy so solid and so well administered, that the neighboring nations submitted and paid tribute to it. The Iroquois were so terrible in war, that the Algonquins and other red tribes of the south would flee at hearing the very name of "Mohawk." They were the fiercest and most formidable people in North America, but were very polite and skilful negotiators, and had a high reputation for hospitality. They were fixed to the soil, and did not change their hunting-grounds as the Algonquins did. It has been remarked that there was a strong resemblance in the principle of the Iroquois confederacy to the Grecian Amphyctionic Council,† and some have even surmised that at a remote period the Greeks had communication with this Continent. Father Charlevoix, a learned Jesuit, who visited New France (Canada) in the middle of the 17th century, says the Iroquois language is mingled with Greek roots: but he seems to think that the Huron language was the root of all the Iroquois dialects: ‡

---

* *History of the Five Indian Nations of Canada*, p. 1.

> "Il s'en faut bien que la langue Huronne s'etende aussi loin que l'Algonquine; ce qui vient sans doute de ce que les peuples qui la parlent ont toujours été moins errans que les Algonquins. Je dis la langue Huronne pour me conformer au sentiment le plus communé ment reçû; car quelques uns soutiennent encore que c'est l'Iroquoise qui est la matrice. Quoiqu'il en soit, tous les sauvages qui sont au sud du fleuve Saint Laurent, depuis la rivière du Sorel, jusqu'à l'extremité du Lac Erié, et même assez proche de la Virginiê, appartiennent à cette langue, et quiconque scait le Huron les entend tous."

---

* *Hist. of Five Ind. Nations*, p. 2. † *Ethnol. Res.* Pt. 3, p. 183.

‡ *Journal d'un Voyage*, etc., Vol. 3, p. 189.

From this it may be inferred that the Hurons are the primitive stock of the Canadian red men. Be that as it may, the Iroquois confederacy was so powerful that the French maintained their occupation of Canada with great difficulty against it. The English had the tact to gain the friendship of the Iroquois by offering them facilities for commerce, and were thus enabled ultimately to supplant the French. It is a remarkable fact that these so-called "savage Indians" respected woman, and gave her her proper place in society. They admitted matrons to their public councils, and allowed them to exercise a veto on the question of war, and to interpose to bring about peace.

To such a pitch of power had the Iroquois confederacy reached at the time of the discovery of New York, in 1609, that there can be little doubt that if the arrival of the Europeans had been delayed a century later it would have absorbed all the tribes situated between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the mouth of the Ohio, if not to the gulf of Mexico.* In 1603, when the French explored Canada, they found the Iroquois at war with the Adirondacks; the latter had the best of the struggle for some time, but at length they were overcome, driven out of their own country, and forced to settle where Quebec now stands.†

Reverting for a moment to the assertion of Father Charlevoix, that there are Greek roots in the Iroquois language, it may be as well to quote what Mr. Colden says on the subject. He was commissioner from England to the Five Nations in the time of George II., and became familiar with their history, customs, and languages. He says:

> "I have not met with any one who understands their language, and also knows anything of grammar, or of the learned languages. Their present minister tells me that their verbs are varied, but in a manner so different from the Greek or Latin that he cannot discover by what rule it was done, and even suspects that every verb has a peculiar mode. They have but few radical words, but they compound their words without end. . . . . They have no labials in their language, nor can they pronounce perfectly any word wherein there is

---

* *Ethn. Res.*, Pt 3., p. 196.

† Colden, p. 23.

a labial. . . . Their language abounds with gutturals and strong aspirations, . . . and their speeches abound with metaphor, after the manner of the Eastern nations."*

These linguistic facts point to an Asiatic origin of the race. This subject was fully discussed in this journal not long since† and need not be further dwelt on now.

One of the most difficult problems connected with the state of North America before the Spanish conquest is the making an approximately correct estimate of the population of the continent. As regards the so called Indians or red men of the forest, there are no written data to base any calculation upon. But as the great majority of the tribes lived by hunting, and as that mode of subsistence does not admit of density of population, but, on the contrary, necessitates the devoting of large tracts of land to the use of a few persons, it is probable that the population had reached its limit, and did not increase; the tribes frequently changed their hunting-grounds, and were constantly at war with each other, two facts which militate against the idea of there being numerous inhabitants. "The rate of reproduction is so small among tribes who live by hunting, and the causes of depopulation so great, that until the period of their colonization, neither to increase nor decrease, but barely to keep up their numbers, is the most favorable view that can be presented."‡

In a survey of two hundred years, so far as facts can be gleaned, many of the bands and sub-tribes have most rapidly declined, and yet a greater number have become entirely extinct. The policy of pursuing the chase is so destructive to human life, and so subversive of every principle of increase and prosperity, that it is amazing that the Indians themselves have not perceived it. But when this fatal delusion is coupled with the policy of petty, predatory, tribal warfare, as it has been for all the period we have been in proximity to them, it is only wonderful that of the tribes who were in North America in 1600 there is a descendant left to recount their history. Assuming, however, the most favorable hypothesis, viz., that, on the whole, the population of native race had remained stationary since the time of Columbus until driven westward by the European colonists; and further assuming that the proportion of souls to the square mile was about the same as may still be found in those territories where Indian tribes still roam, Dakota, Nebraska, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, and other Western districts, a rough guess may still be made as to the total population of the portion of the continent north of the Rio Grande at the time of the arrival of the Spaniards.

---

* *History of the Five Indian Nations of Canada*, p. 25.

† No. XLVII, Dec. 1871, Art. vii, "*Extinct Races of America—the Mound-builders.*"

‡ *Ethn. Res.*, Pt. 2, p. 8.

The total area of the vast region comprised in the United States and British America is about 6,700,000 square miles, of which, however, a very large proportion is uninhabitable, espociable in the far North and Labrador; and a considerable deduction must be made for the area occupied by lakes, rivers, forests, mountain ranges, and deserts. It is not hazarding much to say that at least 2,000,000 square miles are untenantable by man, or, as in the case of Labrador and the Arctic regions, by families very thinly scattered, as the Esquimaux are. In 1847 it was estimated* that the population of the Indian tribes in the whole of the United States was about 400,000, and as the area of the States exclusive of Alaska is in round numbers 3,200,000 square miles, this would give an average of only one soul to eight square miles; but this is not the system on which the calculation should be based. It was found that since the war of Independence the number of deaths in a tribe exceeded the births by nearly 78,000 in a period of 87 years; this was, however, partly owing to the advance and encroachment of the whites upon the Indian hunting-grounds. But there were, in 1847, territories which had not then been encroached upon to any great extent, viz., Texas, New Mexico, California, Oregon, and Utah, which, it was estimated, contained 182,000 Indians. The area of these States is in round numbers 900,000 square miles, which would give about one inhabitant to five square miles, and if we suppose this rule held good in 1492, as regards the whole of the northern portion of the continent—that is to say, from the Rio Grande to the Arctic regions—it would give an estimate of something under a million of persons of Indian race at that period.

---

* Schoolcraft, *Report*, pt. 2, p. 8.

But this estimate requires correction, if, instead of supposing the population to have remained stationary, we suppose it to have steadily declined in the ratio of 77,000 out of 206,000 in each period of 87 years. A simple rule-of-three sum will make the correction. As 206 : 940 (the exact amounts) : : 77 : 194,000—the total amount of the decrease of the entire population in 87 years. Therefore in 1760 the population was 1,134,000. Applying the same process to the preceding 87 years, we shall find that in 1673 the entire population was 1,558,000; in 1576 it was 2,140,000; and in 1499 it was 2,940,000. This might be carried out *ad absurdum;* the reader can choose between the stationary theory and the retrogressive; but we may suggest in favor of the latter, that the numerous burial and fortification mounds, and other remains of antiquity still to be seen in various parts of the United States go far towards proving that this continent was once, at some remote period, much more densely peopled than it was at the time John Cabot discovered it. The accounts of the condition of Mexico, Central and South America, given by the historians of the Spanish Conquest, show that the population of those regions was much greater then than it is even at the present day. "The great name of Columbus," says Horace Greeley,* "is indelibly soiled and stained by his undeniable and conspicuous implication in the enslavement of the aborigines of this continent, so improperly termed 'Indians.' Within two years after his great discovery, before he had set foot on the continent, he was concerned in seizing some scores of natives, carrying them to Spain, and selling them there as slaves. His example was extensively followed. The fierce lust for gold, which inflamed the early adventurers on his track, incited the most reckless, shameless disregard of the rights and happiness of *a harmless and guileless people*, whose very helplessness should have been their defence. Forced to hunt incessantly for gold, and to minister in every way to the imperious appetites of their stranger tyrants, they found in speedy death their only relief from intolerable suffering. *In a few years but a miserable remnant remained*." This extinction of the native races by the advent of Europeans appears to be a law of nature, as the same result has been observed in all parts of the world, wherever a strong race settles by the side of a weak one. It has been so on this continent, and the few remaining tribes of the red race are being rapidly "improved off" of its surface.

---

* *American Conflict*, Nol. 1, p. 27.

Mr. Greeley, however, was mistaken in his estimate of the moral qualities of the Indians. The Peruvians may have been "a harmless and guileless people," though even that is doubtful, seeing that they were addicted to human sacrifices. But all the accounts we have of the natives of ancient Mexico and of the northern continent describe them as cruel, treacherous, bloodthirsty, and licentious, constantly at war with their neighbors and among themselves. And this is the normal condition of all tribes of men who subsist chiefly by hunting; it was so with the ancient Scythians, and those of the middle ages; and when their numbers increased so as to trench on the means of subsistence, they raided on their neighbors, precisely as the red Indians did in the days when they first became known to us, and as they do now whenever they get a chance.

The traditions of the red men of America throw very little light on their origin. From the nature of some of them, we are inclined to adopt the theory that the most remarkable of them are borrowed from a more ancient race of men who had attained to a certain degree of civilization. Thus among the North American Indians there prevails a tradition of a personage of miraculous birth, who was sent among them to clear their rivers, forests, and fishing grounds, and to teach them the arts of peace. He was known among different tribes by the several names of Michabon, Chiabo, Manabozo, Tarenyawagon, and Hiawatha.* But if such a personage ever existed and taught what he is alleged to have done, it is clear that either the Indians were not the people he taught or that they have long since forgotten his teachings, since beyond the fabrication of mats, moccasins, pipes and a few other articles, by hand, they have no notion of "the arts of peace," nor is it known that they ever undertook to clear a forest. As for building a house there is no trace of such a stroke of genius in their history. We are speaking now of Indians in their natural condition when left to themselves, and not of the few who have, under the auspices of American institutions, been located on "reservations" and taught some of the elements of civilization. Let the war-club, paint, tomahawk, and scalping-knife testify as to what the red race is in its natural state. When the North American Indians were first encountered by European settlers, the use of these implements of savage warfare had been traditional among them from time immemorial.

That these red men were the conquerors of a civilized race who flourished on this Continent long ages ago has been rendered certain by the discovery of the remains of an ancient city of vast extent on the site where now stands the city of Lexington, Kentucky. Some of these ruins, noticed by Ashe, the traveller, in 1806, were carefully examined by Professor C. S. Raffinesque, of Transylvania University, in 1820, and described by him in an article in the *Western Review*.† But there was no great interest excited at the time by these researches, and it is only within the last few years that anything like scientific investigation has been directed to the vast erections of the ancient Mound-builders. They were not Indians, for no Indian nation has ever built walled cities, with stone walls and defended by entrenchments, or ever buried their dead in sepulchres hewn in the solid rock, as was the practice among the race which has so completely disappeared. How many centuries have elapsed since the last survivors of them passed away will probably never be known. They left no literature behind them, and so their very name is forgotten. Not a fragment of their history or their language remains. They have vanished like a dream. Hector and Achilles, though mere barbarians, live because sung by Homer. Germanicus lives, as the historian himself said, because narrated by Tacitus; but these builders of mounds perish because no Homer and no Tacitus has told of them. It is the spirit only, which, by the pen, can build immortal monuments.

---

* Schoolcraft, *Algic Researches*, vol. 1, p. 134. *Indian Tribes*, pt. III, p. 314. † For 1820, p. 53.

Roger Williams, Dr. Boudinot, and others maintained the theory that the Indians of North America migrated from Asia; that the once noble (?) race, which has almost melted away, was descended from the ten tribes of Israel, which were driven from Palestine seven hundred years before the Christian era. But this is only theory, and the advent of the Indians and the stock from which they sprung will probably remain an unsettled problem: but that they came here subsequently to the Mound-builders is certain. The appearance of the Indians was the death-knell of that doomed race whose rich and beautiful lands and spoil-gorged cities inflamed the desperate and destitute invaders. The numerous tumuli which yet remain attest the fierceness of the conflict which ensued. A great people were swept out of existence; their cities disappeared; the grass grew above them, and in time the canebrakes and the forests. Out of all this vast extent of conquered territory, the Indians selected a portion as a hunting-ground, and called it "Kan-tuckee," because it had been in truth to them "a dark and bloody ground." It was a shadow land to the Indians. In 1800 some Sacs, who were in St. Louis, said of Kentucky that it was full of the souls of a strange race which their people had long ago exterminated. They regarded this land with superstitious awe. Here they hunted and here they fought, but no tribe was ever known to settle permanently in it. And while they hunted and roamed, and paddled here their bark canoes, unknown centuries rolled away.*

But the same fate to which the red men had consigned the Mound-builders is in waiting for themselves. Its approach was heralded by the landing of Columbus on American soil, and its actual advent came with Cortez. Three hundred and fifty years have rolled away since that event, and the disappearance of the Indians has been steadily progressing. The end is a mere question of time, and no one can seriously doubt that in less than a century it will be a matter of difficulty to find a pure-blooded "Indian" on this continent. Will this be a matter for regret? Certainly not, for a more useless race of men never existed, and this characteristic is sufficient of itself to refute the theory of their descent from the highly-gifted Hebrews, who could boast of sages, prophets, warriors, poets. musicians, and skilled artisans, when the ancestors of the civilized nations of Europe were naked savages.

---

* Ranch, *History of Lexington, Kentucky*, p. 14.

ART. II.—1. *A Short View of Tragedy; its original excellency and corruption: with some reflections on Shakespeare and other Practitioners for the Stage.* RYMER. 1693.

2. *The Ground of Criticism in Tragedy.* DRYDEN. 1679.

3. *Enquiry into the Learning of Shakespeare.* P. WHALLEY. 1748.

4. *Letters on the Writings and Genius of Shakespeare.* J. DENNIS. 1712.

FROM the twilight of English literary history loom four colossal and tremendous spectres, typically masters in the drama, in lyric poetry, in theology, and in philosophy—Shakespeare, Spencer, Hooker, and Bacon. Not only did these four men foreshadow the future of English literature and English scientific and religious thought, they determined the future—its peculiar bent, its literary and philosophical currents—being themselves determined by the century they represented

Four Atlases they, who carried four worlds of thought on their shoulders.

The popular conception of Shakespeare, the least known biographically of the four colossi, the best known intellectually, is that of a tremendous spider-brain cunningly ensconced in a human head, and, without progress, with little culture and less education, instinctively spinning, from abundant and abnormal inner consciousness, wierd webs of drama and poetry. "He was," say they, "a man indifferent to reputation and to the opinion of his contemporaries, producing, because it was in him and he must—a sun shooting athwart the sky at midnight."

Ignoring accumulated evidences, documents in the record office, and other data, these panegyrists and panderers to a popular ideal paint a poet who, lacking both in culture and in opportunities for observation, by virtue of an almost supernatural insight, mastered all problems, solved all difficulties, penetrated all mysteries. "He owed nothing to art and learning," says the Shakespeare-mad. "Natural inspiration," runs the myth "is responsible for those splendid masterpieces of of invention in which critics have professed to find vestiges of the deepest philosophy, of the most acute biological investigation, of perfect insight into the laws of poetry in all its forms, of exact study of nature and of man."

How far this is true will appear presently, for it is proposed, in this paper, to apply the ordinary rules of induction to the literary biography of the creator of Hamlet—himself the Hamlet of his field, every monad-man having a dash of the Hamlet about him—and so to arrange the known and leading facts of his life as to indicate that evolution and progress were ruling elements in his career—that he grew—developed—was what he was partly by life-dream and native bent, partly by operation of the surrounding formative forces.

The state of scientific and philosophical thought incident to that age is summed up in the one word, *Bacon*—who did but cast and give form to the intense and intensely free speculative spirit of the century. The floating, somewhat empirical, yet popularly accepted speculative notions engendered by a century of full consciousness, such as the sixteenth was, are, however, seldom recorded by its reputed thinkers, but enter almost unlimitedly into its poetry and drama, for the primary reason that they minister directly to the vividness and realism of fiction. Jenner's happy medical hit—vaccination—was only the scientific form of a popular notion. Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood had probably a similar springhead. These masses of floating philosophic *nebulæ*, just in the dawn of formulation, still half myth, Shakespeare caught in that wondrous camera of his. In him the groping, instinctive, actinescent consciousness of his public was rendered self-conscious. The thought-drift of the sixteenth century is shored and stored in his dramas of the middle and later periods.

Born and bred in a country town—perhaps half a century behind London in civilization—where men by the ingle-nook still told stories of elves and goblins, of the battlefields of Tewksbury, of the terrible encounter when sad Severn hid its head with affright, of meek Henry the Sixth, of vindictive and basilisk Gloucester, of gracious Edward, of detested and detestable De la Pole. Shakespeare was popular with his public because he represented and interpreted his public, while university-cultured Peele, Greene, Marlowe, and Lilly, who drew less upon popular tradition for materials, and took less heed of traditional estimates, were foreign to the multitude. Being of the crowd, he drew the crowd. They, apparently more inventive in plot, were less realistic in execution.

But these men and their works had a genetic relation to Shakespeare and his, which is quite understated by modern writers. They were Shakespeare-formatives. It was they who dipped in the classical, settled the style and type of the Elizabethan drama, and trimmed it into external symmetry. They had developed to a considerable extent the poetic capacity of the English language before he appeared on the stage. To them was due the creation of that majestic blank verse which Shakespeare so deftly used, the full and flexible rhythm of which Pope afterwards converted into rhymed mathematics, but which has never since lost its hold on English composition. They manufactured the tools with which he carved his dramas from the ivory bone of crude observation, when they rescued poetry and the drama from Latin. In short, from the disjointed patois of the herd they evolved what may be termed structural English, and did thus a work which he, lacking somewhat in philological culture, must inadequately have done for himself. More than this, they laid the corner-stone of the new dramatic structure in breaking loose from the Moralities which had satisfied the dramatic taste of the age preceding, and from the dumb-show drama—parent of the modern spectacular—which once delighted the virgin queen at Kenilworth, and had so often at Windsor. Greene, in his "Never too Late," has preserved a few titles of these once popular Moralities. Very odd now, it would seem, to see titles on a play-bill like the "Twelve Labors of Hercules," the "Highway to Heaven," the "Moral of Man's Wit," and the "Dialogue of Dives," nor are the dramas of the myriad-minded as far removed from those of his forerunners as are theirs from the mysteries and moralities that preceded them.

The age was one of dramatic transformation in England, quite analogous to that which developed Dumas and Hugo in France. Between it and the background lethargy of the Middle Ages intervenes a stormy and self-assertive period of about one hundred and fifty years; a period of national quickening, of realism, of struggle for liberty. The new age in England, as afterwards in France—the age of quickening, as it may be termed—gives rise to new art-impulses in harmony with itself; and, within the brief interval of a generation, a sudden and complete transformation of the drama results: a transformation presented by no other period in English history, in which the regularity of form, the didactic sermons, and philosophical musings of the mysteries and moralities, lose all hold on the popular fancy.

This complete transformation Shakespeare represents in its highest type, but he no more originated it than Dumas and Hugo originated the Romantic type in France. It was in the air, in the consciousness of the people, waiting to find a tongue. Indeed, it is curious that it has occurred to nobody to term this type of drama the Tudor Gothic—for it represents the same metamorphosis in letters that the so-called Tudor Gothic represents in building.

When Shakespeare appeared in London, then, the stage was passing through the shaking and sifting process of a revolution. He did not set it on foot. No proof is there that he controlled or even comprehended it. He simply, with a dramatic instinct akin to the intuitive, interpreted and embodied it in creations, from which, were all formal history of the Elizabethan age to be smitten from the record, a pretty correct intellectual and moral map of it might be reconstructed. The century was Bacon and Shakespeare producing: the one built up a Tudor Gothic structure in philosophy, the other in drama, working hard and systematically; somewhat the same did Spencer in lyric poetry. The trouble is that the dramatist has been mistaken for the century, the work of which he reflected. The age was reason for the dramatist, not the dramatist for the age. The exact year of Shakespeare's advent in London cannot now be ascertained; the motive he had for going there is equally uncertain. A story Walker attributed to the parish clerk of Stratford, in 1693, states that he was first taken into the playhouse as a servitor, and by this means had an opportunity to be what he proved afterwards. There is a myth current also, to the effect that, pricked with a twilight sense of his mission, he ran away to London, leaving his family—consisting of his wife, a daughter named Susannah, and twins respectively named Hammet and Judith—dependent on the occasional contributions of benevolent townsmen; but it is far more likely that he was taken to London by the Cloptons or the Catesbys, who hated the Lucys as cordially as he did, and who were impressed with his poetic talent, or that he joined a strolling company of actors at Stratford, and thus worked his way to the great culture-centre of England. To say the least, Rowe's myth, repeated by so many biographers, has no support in facts. "He had, by a misfortune common enough to young fellows, fallen into ill-company," says Rowe; "and amongst them some that made a frequent practice of deer-stealing, engaged him more than once in robbing a park that belonged to Sir Thomas Lucy. For this he was prosecuted by that gentleman, as he thought, somewhat too severely, and in order to revenge that ill-usage he made a ballad upon him. And though this, probably his first essay in poetry, be lost, yet it is said to have been so very bitter that it redoubled the prosecution against him to that degree that he was compelled to leave his business and family in Warwickshire and shelter himself in London."

Admitting the facts of the deer-stealing and the ballad, which are very likely to be true, though resting on no authority except that of Rowe, and that of the expression, "An I have not ballads made on you all, and sung to filthy tunes"—it is respectfully suggested that deer-stealing and ballad-making were both too popular and too common in that age to entail odium on the offender or occasion a runaway to London. Indeed, the Lucy feud was a religious one, and not one contingent on a ballad. The Lucys were Puritans: the Cloptons, the Catesbys, and the inhabitants of Stratford were adherents of the antique. William Lucy, the father of Sir Thomas, and the friend of Bishop Latimer, had occasioned more than one riot in Stratford, by enforcing the law too rigorously; the Lucys, the Grevilles, and the Combes representing Puritanism—the Catesbys and Cloptons defending the early faith, and supporting the populace. Powerful at the Court of the Tudors, allied remotely to the blood royal, the Lucys and coadjutors were rigid in presenting and persecuting recusants, and in enforcing the penal laws against the same. Thus, in 1592, they presented as a recusant Mrs. Clopton, widow of William Clopton, Henley-in-Arden, Mrs. Mary Arden, widow; and the name of John Shakespeare, not attending service for fear of process for debt, also graces the list. The statute, framed to prevent the people from harboring Jesuits and papal emissaries, as every student of early English law is aware, exacted attendance once a month at the regular parish services. That the people of Stratford hated the Lucys, as represented by Sir Thomas, and the Grevilles—as represented by Sir Fulke and Sir Edward—and feared as thoroughly as they hated the exponents of the odious statute, is apparent from the town records printed by Mr. Halliwell. Indeed, in an action for trespass, Sir Edward Greville against the burgesses of Stratford, in 1601, the name of John Shakespeare appears on the list of witnesses for the defendants. A rampant zealot, with a mania for litigation, hereditary dislike of Sir Thomas Lucy is enough to account for the Justice Shallow (*alias* Lucy) in the "Merry Wives of Windsor," published in 1602, and probably suggested by the trespass-suit of 1601, without assuming that Sir Thomas had ever prosecuted the poet for deer-stealing.

It is quite likely, therefore, that Shakespeare's going to London was a deliberate act and part of a life-dream, engendered, perhaps, by witnessing the crude dramatic performances of his day at Coventry: a life-dream as ever-crescent in its faculty as the summer grass is, as dumb and secret until it burst the shell as the germinal acorn whence the oak. Many an English boy has since tempted the whirlpool of London, pricked by the same dream; many a beardless American has in like manner dared destiny, one in a hundred to wrestle successfully in the *melée* of New York. Inseparable from the poetic prompting and its motive is the fame-dream; and to assume that the Avon bard was an exception in this respect is to assume the monstrosity of a coherent story without a predominant motive, of a poet without poetic sensibility.

Again, of the two, in the sixteenth century, the drama led to fame and fortune more rapidly and directly than did lyric poetry. The profession of the dramatist was to London then what that of the novelist is now, a nostrum to make one's way in the world and enable him at his own proper cost to build a windmill. Greene, the Roberto of his own "Never Too Late," mended his fortune in this way.

Puritanism had not yet leavened the whole lump of English sentiment; the profession of actor or dramatist was still sesame to fame and fortune; Bishops like Bale and Still were reckoned among the patrons of the stage; and more than probable it is that the Stratford boy had long cogitated of London and fame as a dramatic poet. The few extant facts point to this hypothesis; his fruitful career is one only to be accounted for by presupposing a fixed idea: a life-dream, powerful, pervasive, as only a life-dream can be to an imaginative mind, and forever impelling to literary work.

A somewhat subordinate but important question here suggests itself, and pauses for answer. Was the first life-dream of the boy-bard that of fame as a lyric poet, or that of fame as an actor or dramatist? Was it as the Pindar or as the Euripides of his age that he cogitated of celebrity?

The former hypothesis is supported by the fact that his first entry for publication at Stationers' Hall, in 1593, consists of the two long poems, "Venus and Adonis," and "Lucrece." Again, lyric fame is more likely than dramatic to have constituted the first air-castle of a boy imprisoned amid Stratford silences, and taking his first lessons in poetry from the antique ballad-love then current, the lyric quality of which is abundantly illustrated in Percy's "Reliques;" while, again, Ovid ranked foremost in the Latin curriculum of 1600, and the airy, transformative *fantasquerie* of the fanciful pagan distinctly tinges the "Midsummer Night's Dream," though the materials of the play were indigenous. Yet again, and of no less value as a determinant, the invention of Shakespeare, in his first period of production, is as spontaneously and distinctively lyrical, though wrought into dramatic form, as that of Shelley in "Queen Mab," and breaks into bubbles of song so frequently as to suggest either an affectation of Pindaric bent, or that the writer had on hand a store of rhyming tid-bits which he intended to work into the dramatic fabric at every admissible opportunity.

The theory that his first fame-dream was that of actor and dramatist rests upon the three considerations: that he drifted to the theatre at once, after his advent in London; that he was, from the beginning, assiduous both as actor and dramatic author; and that, at the latter, Greene's "Groatsworth of Wit," 1592, a year before the entry of the poems at Stationers' Hall, delivers the mordant thrust—

"There is an upstart crow beautified with our feathers, that, with his tiger's heart wrapped in a player's hide, supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blank verse as the best of you," appropriating one of the finest passages in "Henry VI.," in the double function of stiletto with which to stab, and identity-mark with which to point the allusion. The true solution lies probably in the union of the two. The broad interval that now separates the playwright and the poet did not then exist. Poetry had three divisions—epic, lyric, and dramatic. Poets were of three kinds—a playwright was a dramatic poet.

Shakespeare's literary faculty was balanced as upon a pivot between the lyric and the dramatic. His plays are intensely lyrical; his poems intensely dramatic. His materials fell into the one form or the other by a kind of natural selection. In his vocabulary no thorough distinction between dramatic poetry and lyric poetry was possible. Poetry was. In action, human action, with its netted and meshed complexity of passion and emotion, it fell into dramatic form, taking that form by virtue of an inner necessity; in simple beauty, into the lyric form, taking *that* form by virtue of an interior necessity. But in the one, poetry was just as potential as in the other; and that the Elizabethan magician felt this in his very soul, whether he comprehended it in his understanding or not, his spontaneous adaptation of dress to thought, now descending to prose, now stalking in stately blank verse, now falling into rhyme, now breaking into bubbles and sunlit foam of song, abundantly evidences.

The life-dream of a bundle of human faculties thus balanced, of a poetic fecundity thus determined, would naturally dwell on poetry as potential and poetic form as subordinate. He went to London as a poet: the shape into which his musings eddied and curled, as they lifted themselves spectre-like from the vasty deep of his wondrously prolific imagination—fogs from the soul-sea within him,—was a secondary consideration. His keen, practical mind accepted the conditions of success: money in the capacity of an actor and playwright: empty fame in poetry not adapted to the market: and thus, if aright we read the facts of his life, he entered the theatrical profession.

But whence came the marvelous fathom of man and of what Mr. Carlyle calls the infinitudes? Was it instinctive, intuitive? Or was it the result of observation, enlightened by almost superhuman insight? The mythical conception of Shakespeare assumes the former; but careful analysis of the facts proves it to be untenable. Imagine an age in which the theatre is the centre of thought: with few clubs, without coffee-houses, newspapers, novels. Here, in his hexagonal, half-roofed wooden building of the Elizabethan era, with its boxes, admission from a shilling to half a crown, its congregation on the stage of the wits and critics, its actors in the costume of everyday life, met of an afternoon the Sidneys, the Bacons, the Raleighs, Essexes, and Cecils of the British metropolis; the Falstaffs of the day; the weather-bronzed adventurer of the sea, just from Guinea; the vexed Bermoothes, of the romance-land of the Indias; soldiers of fortune and vagabond Bohemians of all types; honest citizens and grave burgesses; voluptuaries and coxcombs by the dozen —all uniting to form a school of observation, of allusion, of wit, of imagination, never since concentrated in a theatre, and five years of which were a dramatic education: a school having the same advantage over newspapers, novels, and books, as media of information, that the actual seeing of a murder has over the intellectual apprehension that a murder has been committed, or the actual study of fossils over a text-book.

Study it from every standpoint, and the most curious phenomenon presented by the Elizabethan period of English history, transitional as it was, is its heterogeneity: the motley of extravagancies, conceits, queer humors and whims, oddities of dress, individualisms in manners and opinions, no central authority anywhere, which formed the observational materials of Shakespeare's dramas. It was an age of medley, of monads; and thus from the people he met daily, to the people he embodied in drama, intervened but a step. Nor yet had geographer of Ariel and Caliban exorcised the still-vexed Bermoothes; nor yet had Puritan severity thoroughly inoculated religious conviction with the intense but limited religionism that conquered English thought a century later: a consideration in which the critic may find the key to the moral range and freedom from hobbies of theory that seem so phenomenal at first sight in the works of the Elizabethan master. He reflected life as he saw it, not prismatically, but by a kind of dramatic refraction. If, as is supposed, 1585 was the year of his advent in London—saving Greene's epithet of the new Johannes Factotum destined to eclipse them all, which implies that as early as 1592 Shakespeare had given earnest enough of his coming fame to pique the jealousy of his competitors, and the brief notice in "Kind Hearts' Dream," 1592—it is thirteen years before he emerges from the crowd about him, and takes his place as a centre-piece in literary history. In 1598, Francis Meres, who calls himself a Master of Arts of both Universities, sounds the first note of thorough recognition in his "Palladis Tamia," a discourse on English poets. The single brief sentence of unqualified recognition, omitting the titles of twelve plays, quoted as illustrations, runs thus: "Shakespeare, among the English, is the most excellent in both kinds (tragedy and comedy) for the stage." Mention of twelve plays. among them the "Midsummer Night's Dream" and "Romeo and Juliet," follows, the quaint critic concluding with this sixteenth century euphuism: "As the soul of Euphorbos was thought to live in Pythagoras, so the sweet and witty soul of Ovid lives in mellifluous and honey-tongued Shakespeare:" and with an allusion to the poems and the "sugred sonnets."

Add to the twelve dramas quoted by Meres the three parts of "Henry VI.," from which Greene, in the "Groatsworth of Wit," takes his "tiger's heart wrapped in a player's hide"—compare the passage, "O tiger's heart wrapped in a woman's hide!"—and to which Nash alludes in "Peers Penniless;" and it is evident that from 1585 to 1598 the Johannes Factotum had produced thirteen plays—one a year.

The notice of Meres is valuable, however, from another standpoint. Ben Jonson's very best comedy, "Every Man in his Humour" had been known to the public for two years, having appeared in 1596, and here Jonson was at the climax of his popularity; if then, two years after the publication of Jonson's play, Meres could unqualifiedly pronounce Shakespeare the most excellent both in tragedy and comedy, it is obvious that the eclipse of competition seemingly predicted by Greene had already come about. The conclusion is then, from the slender data at hand, that Shakespeare's first seven years in London were years of observation and life-struggle; that it was at least six years before he became eminent enough to be sneered at; that it was not until he had served a dozen years with the Laban at the door that he was permitted to take his rightful place in the Pantheon.

This view of the progress of his career is supported by the fact that the Great House at Stratford-upon-Avon was not bought until 1597, from which year dates a rapid accumulation of real estate, that seems to end in 1605. From 1597 to 1603 his pen was prolific as a wizard's wand: the man was in the zenith of his fame. In 1600 he published five plays; in 1602, one; in 1603, one—the "Tragedy of Hamlet." But between Hamlet, entered in 1603, and "Lear," entered in 1607, intervenes an apparent interval of non-production. In 1605, he ceases accumulating property; in 1616 he is apparently no wealthier than he was eleven years before.

The key to this mystery is no doubt to be sought in the hypothesis that, having enough and to spare, he held the copyright of his plays in his own hands during these last years of his life, intending to publish them himself, as Ben Jonson did his; and this consideration disposes of another popular myth concerning the Elizabethan master, to wit, his supposed carelessness of literary fame. Death overtook him at the work of revising, recasting, for a complete edition, including Macbeth, Timon of Athens, Cymbeline, the Tempest, the Roman plays in a body, the Winter's Tale, and Twelfth Night, still in manuscript; indeed Othello was not published until 1622; and he left the work to John Heminge and Henrie Condell, editors of the great folio edition of 1623. "It had been a thing worthy to be wished," say they in their notice to the reader, "that the author himself had lived to have set forth and overseen his own writings"—words which, taken with the context, that they had scarce received from him a blot in his papers, plainly imply that the poet spent the last years of his life in editing and creating for a volume that should perpetuate his fame, and died suddenly, bequeathing the work of supervision to trusted dramatic coadjutors.

Were it possible to ascertain the exact sequence in which the thirty-seven plays, including Pericles, were written, the task of criticism would be astonishingly simplified. The Comedies certainly represent his first period of production; and the Histories, his maturer manhood.

The Tragedies and Roman plays came later, when sore vexed was he with the mystery of life. For example, Hamlet, as it now exists, Macbeth, Lear, Othello, Timon of Athens, and the Roman plays belong to the era of James I.; while the Histories and most of the Comedies, except the Tempest, are Elizabethan. Thus, in his earlier dramas occur distinct vestiges of the old Stratford folk-lore, mixed with humors, whims, and eccentricities, caught from his contact with men he met at the theatre, and often grotesquely mixed. They deal in the humorous and exceptional in a manner akin to that of Jonson, flash with wit, twinkle with quaintness, bristle with invention. Not until 1603, in Hamlet, is the deeper and more problematic exceptional, that distinguishes him as Shakespeare, introduced. In other words, his first plays draw directly from the life surrounding him, its humors and caprices, from the folk-lore of provincial Stratford, from the types of drama about him, from traditions and tales. Then ensues a period of enlarged study, resulting in the historical series; next, the period of tragedy, in which he deals with the appalling exceptional in intellect, imagination, and passion, with strange depth of insight and almost observational fidelity. He is now original in the boldest acceptation. No more Titanias, no more fairy dreams, no more grotesqueries, no more humors of manners and diction, no more trifles and Ben Jonsonisms. After nearly twenty years of observation, the creative brain begins to cogitate deep, and finds itself face to face with the terrible problem that the Greek dramatists expressed in the one word, *Fate*. From Hamlet on, this one problem, like the ghost in that strange and transitional tragedy of humors, in which the poet has not yet burst into the silent sea of the mystic, but is conscious of a thither drift, is *hic et ubique*.

His dramatic sight, many-lensed as a fly's eye, is now introverted. He studies the men about him as spectres projected against the awful background of the man within him; for every poet's metre of the humanity without is the humanity within. It has been said that every man has a madman inside of him. So he has: and a devil, and an angel, and sundry other infinitudes besides; the germ of every individuality he creates, the bent of every tragedy he fashions. Every poet is a pagan: life to him is but as a set of puppets in the foreground, with a perspective of the infinite behind; and, question as he may its terrible silences, they answer never. The day comes when he must question. Lead by by-paths to faith his questioning may, as Shakespeare's did not; or to sullen submission to the destiny juggernaut, man an insect to be ground under its wheels, as Shakespeare's did.

He is face to face with this problem in Hamlet, but cannot forbear flashes of his old playfulness. This is the key-note of Hamlet's soliloquy—the key-note of Hamlet as a dramatic creation—the moral of his life and death. He is no more a lunatic, as some have conjectured, than in the old story of Saxo, upon which the tragedy is based. It is the grotesque commingle of the pretended lunacy of the traditional Hamlet, and the deepened humor of Shakespeare, with the subjective cogitation of an appalling problem, that gives the Hamlet of the drama its perfect counterfeit of real madness. That way madness lies; more men have maddened with this problem than ever maddened with any other—but the cranky Dane is not mad, and is not meant as mad. Ophelia maddens and dies under the wheels of the juggernaut; but not so her lover, who is ground to death in his sober senses.

But as this play represents the turning-point, it is interesting to hear the poet's own solution of the riddle it moots. It is given in the single sullen sentence: " The rest is silence!" Indebted to his intimacy with Bacon, or to study of the Greek Drama, Shakespeare may have been, for the suggestion of this problem; but from Hamlet on, through Lear and the later tragedies, it possesses him to the exclusion of all other motives. And the true motive of tragedy it is: life producing, death devouring; Matter, a dumb Saturn, eating its own, a relentless cannibal; the rest silence. He pronounces no verdicts, indulges in no dogmatism; paints the terrible real as it is in its deepest deeps, with a catholic truth to nature that, amusing so long as it dealt in humors and caprices, is now awful in its sublimity and in its recognition of inexorable facts, and leaves the reader oppressed with a nightmare sense of the omnipotence of evil, and a pathetic conviction that, however sad as death may be, the very saddest of all is living and loving. And to bring nearer the humanity of Shakespeare, this transition in method is nearly coincident with the death of his only son.

How great, how little is man in the whirlpool of life, studied from this standpoint—at once a hero and a zero! And how Spencer's ideal-men and Carlyle's hero-men shrink and shrivel in comparison! Admitting the validity of this very general classification of his plays, what then becomes of the popular myth, so long fostered by panegyrists, that Shakespeare sprang, Titan-like, upon the age he interpreted, without culture, without observation of life, without progress: a play of nature, who married and died, like other people, as supra-human as Ariel, or as sub-human as Caliban? The age was one of rare Latin culture, in which the Stratford prodigy shared; and if, as Jonson owns, the young man from Stratford had "little Latin and less Greek," when he went to London, it by no means ensues that he was unable to read either. Indeed, Jonson's sneer implies that he knew something of both; not enough, though, to rescue his earlier works from pedantries like "the honey of Hybla," "pitiful Titan," "Diana's foresters," "homo is a *common* name for man," and others of the same kind, which have little place in his later; but enough to sustain the brief biographical condensation, that, a young gentleman of more than average culture and of boundless ambition, Shakespeare went to London in pursuit of his life-dream of fame and fortune as a dramatist, fought out, step by step, the progressive life-struggle so many have since repeated, was for seven years at least too obscure to have left even an impress on the record of his generation, struggled for ten or twelve years before full recognition came or was even deserved, and finally died in the midst of revision and recreation for a complete edition of his work—having, if the metaphor be admissible, dramatized the sixteenth century Englishman.

But how came the myth about? Who forged the mighty fantasy? As concerns the intellectual classes, two great and exceptional critics were the agents of its creation. Profoundly as Coleridge and Schlegel comprehended the metaphysical aspects of Shakespeare's work, both were sadly unscientific and incoherent, and are responsible for not a little of the general misapprehension. Evolution and progress have no part in their estimates. The German critic flounders in marshes of transcendental and deep-sounding absurdity in his theory of Hamlet; the English thinker is so taken with his own epithet, *the myriad-minded*, translated from a Byzantian critic, as to have no inclination for that really valuable psychological analysis of which he was capable. The former attempted to apply the dualism of Hegel to Shakespearean criticism, and got lost in a fog of his own making; the latter created an awful and colossal, yet dimly anthropomorphic, *eidolon*, and dubbed it Shakespeare, whereas it was merely his own ideal of the great philosophical poet he was so fond of talking about, under another name. Both complicated dramatic criticism more than they simplified it: being mostly responsible for the popular conception of Shakespeare as a tremendous and non-human personality—a wierd and potent magician of the drama, web-weaving from within, and calling spirits from the vasty deep at will, not a gifted man, waging a life-battle, and finally, by industry, backed with wonderful insight and invention, winning his position in the van.

But did he originate a new method? This question must be answered in the affirmative, as his works now stand. Had he died before producing Hamlet, and the later tragedies, most of which he left in manuscript, a negative answer would have been the only possible one—for it is only in his later products that he works from within, distinctively and unswervingly. Saving a certain wealth and Gothic intricacy of humor and invention of the filling-in type, in which he exceeded his contemporaries, his first method in no way differs from theirs. Like Dickens, he takes hold of a humor, a pet and peculiar phrase, a shrug of the shoulder, a bob of the head, and whimsically repeats it. Jonson, Greene, Marlowe, and the rest of them, worked in the same way. What this method is capable of is illustrated alike by Falstaff and Uriah Heep; but it differs materially from the method of his later creations, in which there is an infinite light and shadow—the infinite light and shadow of the universal, limited and unfolded in the individual, of the man, particular and actual, in his proper relation to the awful background of potential humanity. Monads of nature, as Falstaff and the Duke of Gloucester are, and hence powerful and unique, they lack the sympathetic relation to the universal that Othello and Lear have; while Hamlet is entitled to the epithet of transitional, the dramatist having abandoned the old exclusive dealing in fantastic humors and whims, in which he was not original, but not having yet sounded the depths of the new in which he was.

These considerations are very general; but they serve to negative the current myth of a Shakespeare blossoming suddenly on the sixteenth century in full-fledged and intuitive originality. Analysis of his first productions, and comparison with the works of his contemporaries, Ben. Jonson for example, lead to the conclusion that of all Elizabethan poets he was the most instinctive in his artistic processes; and, after criticism has exhausted its microscopy and secured one by one the consisting atoms of a work of fiction, this one induction sums up the verdict: every poet, *qui nascitur, non fit*, possesses a poetic insight far outrunning conscious intellectualization, and toils on at his work, blindfold in his understanding, but with unerring and intuitive art-sight—so that in every great poem there is always an element that eludes and outruns conscious analysis. It is this element that distinguishes Shakespeare as a really great poet—for, without it, his creations would lack perspective, as those of Ben Jonson did, and as those of mediocre poets always must. It is this that in his songs, in his sonnets, in Hamlet, Lear, the Tempest, the Midsummer Night's Dream, fulfils the highest condition of beauty as propounded by Bacon. "There is no excellent beauty," says he, perhaps with the "Midsummer Night's Dream" in his mind, "without some strangeness in the proportion." Indeed, Shakespeare's works, or passages rather in one of his plays, undoubtedly suggest Bacon's brief but profound essay, condensing within the limits of a few paragraphs—every one of them a boulder in boldness and insight—the whole philosophy of the beautiful.

The facts of his biography and the formative forces environing and determining the works of the great and Gothic master, have now been cursorily discussed. The result, holding the balances with a hand as firm and steady as that of justice in the traditional myth, is simply this: 1. The lack of facts establishing the exact order of the composition of his plays and poems, one after another, in the instance of Shakespeare, as in that of Pindar in lyric poetry, or that of Plato in philosophy, renders it impossible to trace inductively the progress of his mind, with the minuteness necessary in criticism thoroughly scientific. 2. Facts enough there are to prove beyond cavil that, in all its aspects, the popular conception of the man is as wholly mythical as legendary King Arthur differs from the real man as radically as the ideal Napoleon of M. Theirs differs from the actual Napoleon of M. Lanfrey, or as the Pindar of Byzantine theory differs from the lyric poet of Thebes as he actually was. But these are not facts enough to afford a distinct map either of his outer or of his inner life, the meanderings and doublings, and consecutive progress of either, or even to answer the important question, whether the awful vision of something holding human destiny in its hands, which begins with Hamlet, and forms the atmosphere of his later tragedies, was original and conditioned upon the deepened inner life that followed the death of Hamlet, suggested by the intimacy with Bacon, or caught from perusal of the Greek masters.

ART. III—1. *Histoire de la Civilisation en Europe.* PAR M. GUIZOT. Paris. 1866.

2. *Survey of Human Progress.* BY N. ARNOTT. London. 1861.

MAN is just learning the powerful influence possessed by the various conditions of nature over national character. A race of men is a complex phenomenon. Throughout its whole continuance the hereditary strain derived from its founders is manifested. Next to this come the influences of food, soil, climate, and the other phenomena of nature; and, lastly, such occurrences as wars, migrations, and foreign intercourse. These are the circumstances which build nations. National character is never the work of individuals, but is the slow result of ages of hereditary, social, and meteorological influences.

Historians have devoted themselves too exclusively to the political relations, governmental changes, rebellions, religions, and court trickeries of kingdoms, as if in these lay the whole secret of history. On the idiosyncrasies of rulers, their virtues, vices, and ambitions, the greatest stress has been laid, as if the king were the true arbiter of the State and could by his bare decree determine the direction of national progress.

It must be remembered that general effects spring not from special causes; that the people is not a shape of clay to which the kingly artist may affix what face and form he will; but a vital, thinking mass, on which the monarch may temporarily impress his authority, but on which kingly force can produce no permanent impression. For the people is a compound of all its individuals, and only he who can most deeply descend into the mind of a nation can most effectually modify its character.

It is the thinkers, not the actors, who produce powerful and persistent effects upon national character. If we search back through time for those vigorous souls whose influence has most strongly affected the culture and development of the human race, we stop not at the leaders of armies, or the rulers of kingdoms, but at the emperors of the realm of thought, the mighty thinkers whose words, like the tones of great bells struck in the night of time, throb in endless reverberation through all succeeding ages, melodious echoes to which the ear of the world is always attuned.

Homer, so far distant on the primeval horizon of history as to be almost lost in the morning mists of time, struck the key-note of that marvellous Grecian civilization which has so powerfully affected all succeeding nations.

Of all the great leaders of men who have lorded it so magnificently on the classic soil of Greece, not one has produced a tithe of the effect upon mankind that has resulted from the fugitive song of this blind old poet. Alexander the Great, to whom half the world bowed its head in subjection, passed, and his influence upon the world was soon lost in the turmoil of conflicting peoples; but the sublime work of Homer rolls through time like a river, gathering strength and volume as it proceeds, and ever producing new growths of thought in the rich soil of humanity. So Shakespeare has had a far more powerful effect in moulding the English race than all its rulers, from William the Norman to Victoria. And from his native isle, in ever-spreading circles, his influence has extended, till to-day it embraces the whole civilized world.

Historians look microscopically at the deeds of kings, and, beholding evidence of great political changes, fancy the kingly power to be the supreme architect of the national structure. The telescope, not the microscope, should be used, for centuries must be embraced in the view that would measure kingdoms. As the eye runs down successive centuries, we find nature and circumstance stubbornly resisting the mandates of the mightiest monarchs, so that, ere the dirge is hushed over the remains of the Cæsars and Charlemagnes of history, the world has taken a new breathing-spell, and commenced quietly to forget the doings and decreeings of its dead lords. National progress obeys certain grand laws of unfoldment, on which government must ride as a ship upon the waves, and often with as little influence over the result as a ship has over the ocean depths below; for the king is a creature, not a creator, and those silent causes which mould nations are not amenable to royal authority.

There is native to every man a certain degree of vital and mental energy, the sum of which in a nation constitutes that moving force which produces the tidal flow of history. This energy must have its vent and its channel, and if powerfully flowing in one direction cannot be long held back. All the kingship in the world would seek in vain to repress its current. The only imperial power is that of directing or shrewdly dividing the stream into opposing branches. The force resident in a state is not easily measured, and is seldom fully appreciated. It is both physical and mental: the physical highly in the ascendant in the earlier stages of national existence; the mental gaining precedence in the end. A man is in a certain sense a machine, eliminating muscular force and nervous energy from the elements of nature. These forces must find vent in some direction, and their total sum marks the limits of a nation's capabilities; at least in those earlier stages of existence, ere man has learned to add to his own energies the forces of inorganic nature. Degree given, direction follows, and direction is here a nerve-process, proceeding from the brain and controlled by the mental energies. Mind overrules and directs the action of the vital motive forces, and the greatest king is he who acts as the brain of his people, most fully comprehending their character, and most capable of combining and directing their mental powers.

In man's primitive condition national force is greatly lacking in directive power. Each person obeys his unrestrained impulses, and license widely prevails. There is no progress, because no combinations of the people, no blending of selfish interests to fixed ends. This stage of existence ends when some aspiring soul, invested with the authority of age or strength, assumes leadership of the people, and by using their combined force, achieves results which clearly display the utility of subordination.

Thus everywhere arose chieftainship, the first rude correllation of human energies and their employment in fixed channels. Selfishness and cupidity are the feelings most at work in such a state of society: law means strength, and failure is the only crime recognized in the earliest unwritten code. Hence war is everywhere the employment of uncultivated nations, and national energy first displays itself on the field of battle. The mental desires of men lie at the basis of all their actions. These at first tend only to the gratification of appetite. The stomach is the inspiring cause of the earliest warfare. The battle against beasts becomes battle against man as soon as his possessions tempt the cupidity of his fellows.

Some tribes possess lands more favored by nature than others, blessed with food-producing trees and animals. The possession of these lands becomes a strong incentive to strife. This continuous battling adds rapidly to the authority of the successful chief. As the minds of his followers yield more readily to his directing genius, and subordination becomes a fixed habit, he devises new wars, less for the benefit of his people than for the increase of his authority and reputation. Thus ambition becomes one of the vigorous elements of history.

Nations, thus habituated to warfare, and accustomed to forcibly seize the possessions of weaker or more peaceful neighbors, lost all taste for industrial pursuits. It was much easier to take by force than to gain by labor, and these warlike races became the scourges of all neighboring tribes, their native energies being forcibly bent in one direction, and combined to fixed ends* by their subordination to the rule of their chief.

Not only aggression but defence had to be provided for, and to this numbers became necessary. Weak tribes enrolled themselves under the standards of successful chieftains, others were forced to become tributary either in money or men, and powerful kingdoms arose, the military authority of the successful leader merging into the absolute government of the despotic king. In these primitive periods national force was mainly applied to purposes of destruction. The industries of the more peaceful nations were trodden under foot by their fierce neighbors, and themselves enslaved or exterminated.

---

* Whitney's Oriental Studies, p. 26.

Yet despite this constant overthrow of the results of industry, and the conservative grasp with which each tribe forbade development in its few arts, the world of mankind was improving, and laying up wealth against the long future before it. Man was developing physically, improving in bone, blood, nerve, and sinew, and building a splendid physical foundation for the great mental structure yet to be erected.

Before the onslaught of vigorous barbarians, effete tribes were swept away, and their places filled with the muscular vigor of conquering races. These latter, transplanted to new scenes, and gradually acquiring the peaceful pursuits of their predecessors, applied to art and industry the energy they had applied to war. Industrial development thus advanced in successive waves, as the hand of the warrior grasped with martial vigor the implements of peace, improving on the old and originating new processes. As each such tribe reached its limit of progress, and settled into peace and conservatism, new migrations swept over its territories, and fresh blood replaced the effete strain of the settled inhabitants.

This process, continued through generations—through centuries, through ages, whose immense duration science is but faintly beginning to determine—could not fail to produce a powerful effect upon the physique of mankind. It was a true process of natural selection, in which the weak constantly yielded to the strong, mankind developing at once in muscular vigor and in mental strength through the action of these varied causes. As man's powers advanced, the mind gradually gained preëminence over the muscles, and in the great treasury of mankind mental as well as physical wealth began to accumulate.

With the era of mental progress the blind tendency to destruction, which had formerly animated the tribes, ceased to employ all the energies of the vigorous races; a portion of their strength was applied to purposes of construction, and the world began more rapidly to lay up stock for that grand future to which all things tend. This process of construction had its two phases: physical and mental; the physical the sport of barbarous aggression, its remains, ruins; the mental, safe from the sword, and possessed of a vitality which the assaults of time itself failed to overcome.

The earliest mental constructive movement of mankind lay in the invention of language, that rare vehicle of thought which has since grown into so colossal proportions that the study of its growth, its decadence, its correllations, and its present forms, constitutes not the least intricate of the sciences. In this great philological labor there was probably little plan and as little consciousness of the amount of work performed. The man who invented a new root or a fresh idea of grammatical inflection, did so unconscious of merit; the man who built a new tower or temple, supposed his labor was to be the delight of latest futurity; yet the temple has crumbled into dust, while the root remains, the vital centre of a grand tree of words. There has been a vast amount of mental energy applied in this direction, and the present is rich with the labor of the past, rich to an extent we should fully appreciate were we now deprived of language and had to devote our national force to rebuild it.

But coeval with language appears religion. Superstition is as old as thought, and its productions are invested with an antiquity to which history can lay no claim. Yet many of the ancient beliefs and fancies are vital to the present day, still living in the legends and popular observances of Christian nations. Through ages of advancing doctrines and creeds, the world has been moving onward and upward; passing from the lowest fetichism, through successive grades of nature-worship, astronomical religion, and mythology, to the highest of philosophical and metaphysical creeds. Each level of belief, as attained, serves as a resting-place and foot-hold for the mind of man, from which he steps upwards, in the fulness of time, to a higher level.

Thus each creed-maker, each delver into the mysteries of the unseen world, who, in his conception of the gods, saw further into the infinite than his fellows, who discovered a new moral apothegm, or at any point displayed a higher appreciation of man's duties, paid his tax in the purest coin into the great human treasury.

Man moves not upwards *per saltum*, but by slow and painful efforts; in some lines of development and at some stages of growth, centuries adding but imperceptibly to his progress. The human search for truth has been that of the unskilled man, who wanders through a valley of minerals in search of precious stones. One shining pebble after another is admired, cherished, and finally discarded for a more attractive stone, and only after many errors and many renewed attempts does he at last learn the tests by which the true jewel may be distinguished.

So we are the richer that our unskilled ancestors slowly educated themselves into an appreciation of religious truth, trying and discarding system after system, growing into successive higher creeds, building gradually a grand temple of morality, and forcing rude and rebellious man to worship therein. Thus, when the time came for Christianity to collate into a vital whole these moral apothegms of the past, it found the mind of man ready to receive them.

This is world wealth of the purest and most enduring character. Language and religion advanced, not only side by side, but in many respects hand in hand, in their slow growth. The scope and richness of language had to be increased to admit of the expression of superior religious conceptions, and many mythological dogmas grew up from a misconception of the origin and full meaning of words.

When history dawned upon the world, man was possessed of rich philological, philosophical, and theological treasures whose extent and value he was far from appreciating, yet which formed the necessary foundation on which was erected the vast edifice of modern civilization. Much we owe the past for this precious heritage which it has found time to lay up for us in the midst of its warlike turmoil, and which we yet enjoy without due appreciation of the vast mental labor employed in its production.

But religion went further. In the priesthood arose a class with higher aims than the fierce desire to battle, a class pledged to peace, the natural recipients of the scanty learning of their people, strong in mental prowess, and fully alive to the fact that "Knowledge is Power." There was a caste with the time and the incentive to think. At last, thought was cultivated for itself alone; as an end, not as a means, save for the influence and authority given by superior knowledge.

What forms the speculations and researches of mankind first took we do not know, except in so far as our discoveries in primitive philology and metaphysics let us into the secret. The earliest written records are indicative of an advanced grade. Yet from these we know something of the contributions paid by the various early nations into the pre-historic stock of learning. That the Egyptian priesthood, at an exceedingly remote period, attained to great proficiency in arts that to the people appeared magical, there is abundant evidence. The record in the Pentateuch is but one of the evidences of the scientific knowledge possessed by this ancient priesthood.

On the delta of the Euphrates, from their brick-built towers, the Chaldean priests searched the heavens, and wrote on clay tablets, religiously preserved, the records of many centuries of close observation of the stellar and planetary movements. In China numerous arts arose; and many important discoveries were made, through the intelligent researches of this and the other unemployed classes. In India the energies of the priesthood were largely directed to speculation, and philosophical systems of a lofty order arose.* Thus each race of old made its special contribution to the common treasury of the nations.

War too long persisted in must dry the fountain from which it drinks. A world may become so ravaged as to have nothing left to tempt cupidity. Hence even the fiercest people must have their intervals of repose and their means of peaceful support during these intervals. The savage has the wild animal to subsist upon. The barbarous nomad succeeded in taming certain docile animals, and learned to employ them both for food and carriage, a legacy he has left as one of his contributions to the world's stock. But all countries are not fitted to these wandering habits. Defence against foreign aggression is also a powerful incentive to condensation of tribes in fixed positions. These positions are not arbitrary, but are governed by certain necessary conditions. Natural defences and facility of food production are the first of these conditions. The growth of an edible grain or of an important fruit was of the greatest importance in fixing the early centres of civilization. Rice in the East, millet and the date in Egypt, settled kingdoms that attained prosperity while the rest of the world was savage. In these grain-consuming countries was born the all-important art of agriculture. This most conservative of the arts was probably of interminable slowness in its development. Yet gradually man learned to plant the seeds of edible plants, to break the ground for their reception; now accident, now experiment, added a new plant to the list of edibles, and this process, continued through many centuries, has made us possessors of a wide range of plants useful for food and clothing, a most important part of the well-invested labor of the past, from which we are daily drawing interest.

---

* En Egypte c'était le principe theocratique qui possedait la societé tout entière. Dans l'Inde vous trouverez le meme fait.—GUIZOT, *Histoire de la Civilisation*, p. 34.

But food and defence not being always combined, artificial walls were needed to replace the lack of natural ones. The desire felt by a vigorous government to concentrate its forces suggested the idea of building these walls around cities, in which, security being thus provided for, wealth accumulated. and leisure gained, religion erected its temples, government its forts and palaces, and the people, in humble imitation, their huts.

Thence sprung architecture, at first rude and uncouth, yet even in these rude periods frequently cyclopean in strength. The original design of defence and shelter was followed by the promptings of luxury, the desire to build monuments for the future, aided by the imperial force of despotism. The Egyptian Pyramids will witness to the desire for fame in their builders, and the exhaustive employment of the vigor of the nation in their erection. All the world is strewn with the ruins of the works of these ancient architects. From England to India, from Mexico to Peru, the massive remains of the earliest orders of architecture attest the wish and the failure of those who thought to build for all time.

But, through these slow centuries, immature yet often grand designs of architecture slowly grew, reaching at length its glorious culmination on the classic shores of Greece, the fragments of whose noble works yet remain, treasures of beauty to the world.

Man's physical labors have not the vitality of his mental work. The first lie visible upon the face of the earth, for the iron foot of war to tread upon and crush into indistinguishable ruin. All that ravage has left us are such cyclopean masses as defied its efforts, or occasional works of beauty which caprice, accident, the courage of their builders, or frequently the inhospitable desert which war made around them, had preserved to our times. But thought is not amenable to the sword; it survives wars and dynasties, *and mocks the hand that would suppress it.* Our chief indebtedness is not to the hands, but to the brains, of our ancient progenitors. Their architectural remains are important to us as historical records and useful models; their thought is essential to us as gradually devising and perfecting that system of habitation, and domestic comfort and convenience, which we can only claim to have improved upon, not to have originated. World wealth has little analogy to what we are now content to term wealth, consisting, as it does, mostly of ideas. The thought of the past is the platform on which our present enlightenment stands, the foundation which the vaguely directed efforts of thousands of years have deeply laid, and on which the lofty present towers in splendor, a temple truly not made by hands.

The physical characteristics of a country strongly influence the direction taken by the energies of its inhabitants, and the result produced. Of these agencies temperature is perhaps the most important. The sun is a grand arbiter of human destiny. In frigid regions the difficulty of food-getting and shelter is so great as to absorb all the energies of the people. An overworked race has no time to think. Leisure and incentive are needed for advantageous thought. In winter they have leisure, but then no incentive, their food-supply being already procured. Moreover, a flesh-eating people never advances beyond the simple art of killing. Their harvest is made for them, and they have only to reap it.

In torrid zones, on the contrary, nature performs the labors of the field. Food is a spontaneous production of the soil and the sun, and man needs only to pluck and eat. Here, too, there is no lack of leisure, where " to the tickling of a hoe the earth laughs with a harvest" ; but incentive is wanting. To a people without a need, fully supplied by bountiful nature, what hope is there of attaining to the advanced necessities of a refined people?

At the basis of all civilization is the need of labor. The first incentive to progress is that of a limited amount of exertion in procuring the means of existence. This effort produces a bodily and mental vigor which fits man for higher aims. But a yet more important demand is that of care and prevision. Agriculture stands at the base of civilization, teaching man the value of labor, the rich rewards to be reaped by skilfully-directed toil, the necessity of providing for the future and profiting by the past, and the great importance of observing the changes and phenomena of nature. To such slowly-built habits of economy, industry, and observation the world is indebted for much of its present enlightenment.

Such is the energy of tropical nature that man becomes dwarfed, and yields himself captive to that vigorous luxuriance which needs no aid from his hands, and which disdains his efforts at restriction. Ere art can be won, nature must be subdued, and there is as little hope of an ignorant savage controlling the marvellous vegetation of Brazil, or steadily toiling under the fiery heats of Africa, as there is of the Esquimaux gathering harvests from the iceberg.

Nor was civilization likely to attain marked development in the present temperate regions. The savage aborigines of America and Europe dwelt in interminable woods, or on vast prairies, sterile, save to the hands of cultivated industry, the future grains being as yet but wild grasses, animals and certain indigenous fruits furnishing them a scanty subsistence. In no case do we find an advanced civilization having its origin in one of these primeval forests. True, the present American savage was preceded by a race which has left behind it rude yet massive works of art. This race attained a certain degree of immature civilization. Its most striking results appear in the great mounds of the Mississippi Valley. This heaping of earth into memorial mounds is one of the first evidences that barbarian man has arrived at a sense of his own importance in the creation, and at a desire of impressing futurity with this importance.

They are found throughout the earth, often unaccompanied by other marked signs of advancement, though in the case of the American aborigines the remains of pottery, of wrought minerals, and of mining operations, attest a considerable degree of progress. Of evidences of agriculture we have only the use of maize, which they may have bequeathed to their successors. This, the highest step of advancement attained in temperate America, is paralleled in Central Asia by the domestication of animals. This region consists of woodless steppes suitable only for grazing, and in the long range of past time its inhabitants have gradually tamed and employed, as human aids, nearly all the animals capable of useful domestication.

But the birth of the true plants of civilization needed more favorable conditions. First a fertile soil, some indigenous fruit or grain yielding richly with rude cultivation, yet sufficiently difficult to need labor, and sufficiently precarious to require providence in its cultivators. If in a tropical country, a lack of rain was necessary to repress its fertility; if in temperate regions, sufficient rain to make the soil moderately fertile, yet not enough to burden the land with forests.

From such conditions the more advanced grades of human progress sprung. In a rainless tropic, irrigation gave birth to the civilization of Peru. On the fertile table land of Mexico arose a second immature western civilization. Egypt was civilized by the Nile sediment and the date palm. Hindostan by rice and its native fertility. It was not simply the fact of the peculiar natural conditions of these countries that produced such results, but the fact that these conditions, in connection with their favorable political situation, aided, if they did not irresistibly produce, the growth of great empires.

In these, the people, being protected from aggression, and forced to labor by the necessities of abundant populations, made the cultivation of the soil the basis of what little talent for progress they possessed, and gradually but surely developed the science of agriculture to a very considerable extent.

In Chaldea and China, like causes produced like effects.* Great empires arose wherever favored by natural conditions. The necessities of these empires produced agriculture and manufactures in their primitive forms. The pride of princes and the need of governments aided the development of architecture and the discovery and application of political and legal principles. The desire of the priestly class to advance their influence as well as to exercise their energies led them to study the laws of nature, a study which usually ends in forcing the student to pursue it for itself alone, whatever may have been his original incentive.

Human progress, thus carried onward from its primitive stage by the natural results of the social conditions in great empires, aided by the hereditary genius of the peoples forming those empires, advanced till it reached a limit imposed on it by the conditions producing it. At this limit it ceased advancing, and a process of decadence commenced. But while these empires were growing, a people, destined to lead the van of future development, and which had been for past ages gathering physical energy from the warfare and nomad unrest of Central Asia, was migrating in successive waves from its natal seat, and overflowing Europe with the devastating vigor of a deluge. When finally the Aryans settled in their new seats, the European aborigines had nearly disappeared under the fierce onslaught of their conquerors.

Of all these Aryan invaders the Hellenes finally established themselves under conditions most conducive to civilized advancement. In the mountainous peninsula of Greece, with a genial climate, a remarkably clear atmosphere, with the bright waters of the ocean everywhere indenting their shores, their efforts at self-defence aided by mountain barriers, their soil unproductive, necessitating habits of temperance, and preventing thronged populations, divided by natural boundaries into numerous small, aggressive, and emulative communities; they were splendidly situated, not for originating civilization, but for grasping that already produced, and turning their migratory and war-like energies to more useful exercise in advancing the arts of peace.*

---

* Quand on considere les civilisations antiques, on les trouve empruntes d'un singulier caractère d'unité dans les institutions, les idées, les mœurs; une force unique gouverne et décide de tout.—GUIZOT, p. 34.

Their situation was not only advantageous naturally, but politically. To the south, within easy reach, lay Egypt, with all its great architectural, mechanical, and scientific wealth. On the eastern shore of their seas dwelt the Phœnicians, the great maritime and trading people of antiquity, with cities and literary culture only second to those of Egypt. Eastward still, but within easy reach, lay Assyria, the recipient of all the arts and culture of the Chaldeans.

The active minds and hereditary genius of the Greeks soon availed themselves of these conservatories of pre-historic culture surrounding them. In the origin of their enlightenment the influence of all these nations is easily traceable; but they rapidly developed the semi-barbarous civilization of the Nile and the Euphrates to a stage of marvellous development which, at its climax and in its special phase, has never since been equalled.

The world had now gained an impetus which no obstacles could henceforth long overcome, no deluge of barbarism destroy. The stimulus of Grecian thought acted on the Latin mind, and aided by the preceding Etruscan culture, gave the torch of civilization to the rapidly-growing Roman empire. The arms of the legions carried this great gift over the accessible world, moulding a channel of advanced thought for the enlivening flow of the waters of Christianity.

The subsequent physical overflow of barbarians southward reacted in a mental overflow northward. The thought with which these shores were warm penetrated in time the mind of the German Aryans, and civilized the north. The forest region, so sterile to savage hands, proved fertile to the seeds of southern art and knowledge, and has formed the true cradle of modern progress.

---

* Taine, Art in Greece.

We have made sufficient premises to perceive that civilization is not a direct sum of the energies of mankind. The problem is far more intricate. Each nation is possessed of a wealth of innate energy. This is mainly employed on objects of temporary advantage. Comparatively small is the portion laid up in that world stock which is to be for the benefit of all the future, and into which falls everything new, be it a new word, a new thought, a new mode. For new things are vital, and grow to unforeseen consequences, and we are daily reaping the fruit grown from seeds of originality planted in the far past. But, while every nation employs some fixed portion of its energy in aiding the progressive movement of mankind, each gives vent to its native vigor in fixed directions, and if we admit here the idea of the correllation of forces, it must be granted that the efforts of certain races, though well directed for their own immediate advantage, have proved ill for the world's advancement by dragging down civilization far towards their own level.

We may take now a closer view of the payments which the principal nations and periods have made into the world's treasury, what coin they have used, and whether time has pronounced it counterfeit or sterling.

The oldest nations of which we have knowledge are so deeply hidden in the dim mists of the past that they can only be seen "as through a glass, darkly." Every portion of Southern and Central Asia, through untold centuries of prehistoric time, laid up the capital of culture whose interest we are still employing. Language was, on this vast continent, brought to a degree of grammatical perfection to which no modern language can lay claim. Here arose the various religions of the world whose advanced creeds still occupy the mind of man. In India arose metaphysics, lyric poetry, and a complex literature. In Chaldea, astronomy; in Assyria, a considerable advance in grammar, natural history, and statistics. In China, agriculture, architecture, and general science made great progress, and here arose that ideal of perfect government,—so poorly applied in modern China,—the investment of intellect and knowledge with power. In Arabia and Phœnicia, commerce and maritime enterprise made remarkable advancement; and in Egypt an Asiatic race developed architecture to a degree which is still the marvel of modern nations.

When the age for the birth of history had arrived, it found the world possessed of a vast treasure of ancient thought, whose full amount we have now no means of declaring, but which rendered comparatively easy the labors of succeeding nations. Indestructibility is an attribute of thought alone. While towers and temples fall and crumble into dust, an idea will live through the fall and dissolution of empires, and survive in all its pristine beauty to gladden the hearts of yet unborn peoples. Thus, thoughts that arose in the minds of barbarous nomads, tending their flocks and watching the starry skies in ancient Arya, formed the roots of that tree which grew into the magnificent mythology of Greece.

But crossing the dim horizon of time into the domains of settled history, Greece first demands our attention. Glorious was the contribution of this enlightened race to the world's stock of thought. In every phase of the finer elements of human progress the Hellenes attained a development which lifts them to the highest throne of human glory. Art is the motto stamped on the sterling coin of their enlightenment. The poetry, drama, sculpture, oratory, architecture, and language of this rare people, are all deeply pervaded with that artistic spirit which has proved the necessary corrective of the Gothic redundancy of the modern age.

The empire of Alexander gave a fatal blow to the chief glory of Greece. Conquest was his watchword, and Asia fell beneath his sword. This, however, was but a spasmodic effort of military force whose results by no means equalled its brilliancy. But Rome arose, with a national idea similar to the personal idea of Alexander, and in proportion as the life of a nation surpasses that of an individual her conquests exceeded his in permanence of effect. From England to Persia, from the German woods to Sahara, spread the iron civilization of Rome, impressing itself so deeply upon the human soil that all the barbarous deluge of the North failed to wash it out. Rome had no native art. It borrowed largely from conquered Greece, and built a city and a literature in which the roundness and polish of Grecian art is strangely mingled with the directness and vigor of Roman strength. Rome was but a virtuoso, ravaging the world, embellishing its city, and cultivating its mind with the best results of the labor and thought of all mankind, and grasping in its iron hand a thousand fragments of world treasure which were so scattered through the conquered world. Side by side with these advances in art, science, politics, and military skill, morals were being gradually coördinated into systems, and ruling with more and more potency the nations of the world, as they one by one stepped out of the mental gloom of barbarism into the light of civilization.

Back in time further than history can reach, and at the remotest limits of tradition, we see the great forms of the early teachers of mankind looming, half visible, through the mists of the far past, grand and dim as are the giants of the Brocken to the eyes of wondering travellers. With surprise we find in the works of Confucius and of Zoroaster systems of ethics and moral apothegms equal, in many respects, to any modern teachings; superior, in most respects, to modern morality.* In India both the Buddhists and the Brahmins possessed moral and philosophical ideas which are equally a wonder to us, and which were far above the comprehension and action of their people.

Thus, throughout man's existence, great minds, centuries in advance of their age, have been rising, casting the blinding light of too brilliant truth upon the shrinking world, and passing away apparently without effect upon the purblind worms at their feet. But their grand ideas take root in human literature, if not in human minds, and the time will surely come when the world will grow up to the level of every worthy thought, and take into its soul, as a part of its nature, that which has existed but in its brain or in its books.

---

* Whitney, p. 195.

The time came in which a portion of the world was prepared to accept a higher standard of morality. Christ arose, and by His teachings and example set in motion a mighty circle of influence which gradually drew the nations of Europe within its bounds, and in its youth conquered Rome, the great conqueror. Thenceforth a purer and higher system of ethics prevailed, and the luxury and libertinism of Rome was followed by the lofty ideal of Christian morals.

Next in the East, that nursery of invasion, arose another of those peculiar concentrations of national energy around a central thought, of which history yields so few instances. This was the migration of a vital idea, that dogma of the unity of God which Mohammed has so firmly impressed upon the Saracen mind. Centuries before, the Buddhistic idea of the equality of man had made a peaceful conquest of Central Asia. This thought of the Arab prophet went out sword in hand, and, like the dead grass before the prairie fire, fell the effete paganisms of Asia and Africa. Fanaticism and the principle of armed proselytism so condensed the national vigor, bodily and mental, of the Arabians, that they became as a mighty engine in the hands of their leaders, and were hurled like a thunderbolt from Spain to India, overflowing nations as old as history and systems more ancient.

A material empire, so rapidly built, was almost as rapidly dismembered. As their central idea lost its vitality, their unity of purpose ended, and the dismayed nations began to make head against their vigorous foe. But strong was the grasp of Islamism, and its mental empire is yet a wide one. In Alexandria the Moslems conquered the last stronghold of Grecian learning, and their energetic mind, yet distended with a new thought, and freed from the conservative logic of habit, became readily porous to this new mental nutriment. Such was the germ of the singular Saracen enlightenment which is the only light in the gloom of the Dark Ages.

The mental invigoration of Gothic Europe sprung not from Rome alone. While night yet lay heavy upon the European mind, the spirit of old Greece had kindled the Arabian intellect into a noonday glow. But it was old wine in new bottles. The Saracen genius is diametrically opposite to that of Greece, replacing the moderate, graceful, delicately rounded forms of Grecian thought with the fantastic, wildly imaginative Asiatic cast of mentality.

Yet the thoughts endured intact in their new dress. The works of the great master-minds of Greece became part of the Saracen literature. The doctrines of Aristotle and Plato were taught in the Saracen cities of Spain, together with the results of Arabian science; and ere Spain, in her brutal self-immolation, had succeeded in driving intellect from her shores, Europe was widely leavened with Saracen thought.

But it is less the channels in which the river of thought flows down through the ages that we care to determine, than the original currents which compose this river, and the constituents of the mighty stream. In it flow, in a dissolved state, the thoughts of ages of human existence, carefully wrought out of the pure ore of God's universe of matter and mind, and cast with a lavish hand into the grand stream which moves onward forever, digging its channel deep in the soul of mankind.

Ideas have more force on the human race than all the world's facts. Mental spurs have stirred nations into more vigorous exercise of their innate energies than any of the ordinary strivings for wealth and power. We have seen how an idea flung the Saracen race like a thunderbolt from end to end of the world. The innate force of the people of Arabia was no greater than that of the races they conquered, but, gathered in one grand mass round their central idea, it broke through the divided energies of their foes like a cannon-ball in which every molecule of iron is gathered round a common centre of gravity and motion.

So in the Middle Ages of Europe the mystic supernaturalism of the Germanic races readily lent itself to the insanity of the Crusades, and the force of an idea led wave after wave of the best blood of Europe eastward, only to be dashed to pieces upon the shores of Asia.* Had the Crusaders been animated with the real singleness of purpose of their adversaries, and had their leaders laid down ambition when they took up the cross, there would have been a different history of this wild effort of a superstition-maddened continent.

In the career of Napoleon is the most striking modern instance of what one mind can perform by gathering to its aid the energies of a nation. The people of France, having, after centuries of forced subservience to a feudal system, risen in blind fury and cast its incubus fiercely aside, turned against combined Europe, and vigorously flung itself against the threatening wall of aggression. Alexander and Mohammed had already presented examples of the irresistibility of a properly concentrated national force. Still more remarkable are the achievements of Napoleon when we consider the civilized vigor of the nations against whom he fought. France in his moulding hands became a machine, under whose powerful blows Europe fell. The ocean in the west and winter in the east at length overthrew the Corsican giant. But, as a firebrand will kindle a Gehenna, so his vivid thought had stirred all Europe to enlivening action, enabling it to throw off the traces of the chain of feudalism, and emerge, fresh and vigorous, into the glowing sunburst of the present.

All this is world treasure. Into the mighty treasury of human knowledge every nation must pay its tax. Every display of mental energy, even if misdirected, benefits mankind, for the mistakes and failures of the nations often prove more useful lessons than their successes. The various scientific theories now entertained were reached only through a series of hypotheses, each useful in coördinating the results of former experiment, and narrowing the path in which truth should be sought. So the innumerable human attempts at national constitutions, at law, government, language, religion, have, while each more or less ill-directed, supplied the world with a wide range of experience, and by narrowing the chances of going astray, led to juster and more effective systems. Thought has obeyed no rudder in its progress, simply drifting unto the future over the ocean of time. But year by year it has felt the trade winds of human intellect, and in all its vagaries still made headway in the proper course.

---

* Le premier caractere des croisades, c'est leur universalité; l'Europe entière y a concouru; elles ont été le premier événement européan, * * * Rois, seigneurs, pretres, bourgeois, peuple des campagnes, tous prennent aux croisades le meme interet, le meme part.—GUIZOT, page 227.

Of late years a rudder has been applied to this noble ship. The sciences of political economy and socialism have for their object the collating the results of human thought and endeavor from the beginning of history to the present day, the study of man's failures and successes, the mapping out that dark realm of social condition with all the tracks which have yet been discovered running over its surface, showing into what ocean all streams of thought flow, to what end all roads lead. Only in new paths need man now walk blindly; the past is already mapped and illumined.

Into the sea of oblivion much precious freight has sunk. The ocean bottom is not more thickly strewn with wrecks than is time with man's lost wealth. Yet the present is more deeply the debtor of the past than it is willing to acknowledge. We may claim as our own the modes of applying the physical forces of nature from which have sprung so grand results. But our mental treasures are a heritage from all the past, and however loftily we have built upon them, the foundation was needed ere the building could arise. In language, philosophy, art, science, religion, literature, social economy, government, all those thought-formations to which the printing press has given indestructibility, the past is largely our creditor. For the destructible mechanical results of the present we have ourselves to thank. Only the thought in these inventions is durable. Convulsions of nature may sweep all traces of man's work from the face of the earth. But until idea itself yields to convulsion the world's wealth is secure. From the marriage of man's cultivated energies and the forces of nature a new world would soon arise upon the ruins of the old.

No longer is war the chief channel in which national energies are concentrated. The mental forces now surpass the physical, and the nations of the present are gaining celebrity from the vigor and success of their campaigns against the dark foe, Ignorance. One by one its strongholds are falling before the onslaught, and step by step the world is pressing towards that horizon over which the sun of a glorious future already shines.

But though physical erections lack the permanence of ideas, and though the various industrial achievements of the past exist but as ruins, yet temporarily the results of industry are world wealth of the most essential character. The hands and brains of mankind are now employed chiefly in constructive purposes, and the effect of the great energy of the human race, when usefully applied, is being displayed in marvellous results.

Centuries in our day do the work of milleniums of past time. Great as are the thought contributions of the ancient to the modern world, and much as we stand indebted to the thinkers of old for the languages, morals, science, and art they have bequeathed to us, we are much more greatly their debtor for the conditions naturally resulting from their long enduring labors.

Among the most important of these conditions is the establishment of free government, in which every man has full privilege of thought and belief, and protection in the results of his labor. Science was fettered until man become freed from the lash of intolerant bigotry. Long has knowledge fought against ignorance and superstition for the production of this result. Not until the present century has the soul of the thinker been in any proper sense loosened from its bonds. Even yet, it has to lift with it, or be crushed under, a weight of ignorant opposition and social proscription at its every movement upward.

Yet, even this partial freeing of man's hands from the fetters of theological and social conservatism has had a most marvellous result. The human soul, like an arrow from a tense bow, long held back by the strong hand of intolerance, has flowed from the loosened string, and is swiftly gliding up the empyrean of progress.

In every branch of science, art, literature, and mechanics, the grandest achievements have been performed. No longer relying on his own hands, man has made the sun, the air, the earth, the sea, his laborers. The powers of nature are bent aside from their ancient course and forced to move through channels prescribed them by this puny creature, their former slave. In consequence, the world of mankind is being rapidly redeemed from error, want, ignorance, disease, and the various ills to which savage flesh is heir, and is rising into the general enjoyment of comfort, luxury even; while the stream of knowledge, rapidly widening and deepening, is adding wonderfully to our powers of achievement, and grandly extending our scope of useful labor and our field of happiness.

Every railroad built, every canal dug, every telegraph wire stretched, every vessel launched, every city erected, every new field sown, is a direct payment into the great treasury of mankind; significant, not only to us but to our descendants, of increased facilities of intercourse, of quicker communication, of more extended commerce, of more various and more comfortable homes, of greater and cheaper food-supplies. What has not been, what is not being done in these directions? On every side around us roars the iron voice of industry, building up far faster than time and change can throw down; and luxuries which were of old the pride of palaces now reside within the walls of hovels. All physical nature is ransacked for its supplies of material, all mental nature for its principles of application, and from a happy union of the two the great present is being formed.

But this is not the only, nor the highest, domain of modern progress. Not mechanics only is advancing, but science and literature are keeping pace with it; and, despite the pitiable displays of human greed and mendacity, the moral sense of the world at large is moving upward. Philanthropy has attained a development never witnessed in former ages of the world. Not the least among human treasures are the numerous colleges, hospitals, and other free institutions built by the accumulated wealth of generous donors. Single souls, big with benevolence, have forced a mitigation of the horrors of prison discipline, made slavery odious, and relieved the great hives of humanity of much of the misery and crime which naturally gravitate to the shadowy quarters of mighty cities.

War is becoming distasteful to the human soul, not for lack of bravery, but for horror of suffering. The cruel sports of the great cities of antiquity could no more be revived in a modern metropolis than could the mythology of Greece be taught in modern temples. This grand idea of human fraternity is being developed, till the peoples, if not the rulers, of civilized nations, are ready to clasp hands as sons of one father, and decide their disputes by the calm voice of peaceful decision rather than by the bloody settlement of the sword. In this new Republic beyond the seas all nations are becoming one nation, sons of every race and every climate clasping hands and merging into one strange compound, the whole world being being the soil, all mankind the seed, whence is springing the wondrous plant of American citizenship.

ART. IV.—1. *Vie de* J. B. DE LA SALLE. Par M. LAMY. Paris.

2. *Memoir of the Abbé Lacordaire.* MONTALEMBERT.

3. *Œuvres du tres Hon. Frère Philippe.* 1836, 1872.

4. *Les Frères des Ecoles Chrétiennes en Amerique.* RENE DE SAINT MAURIS.

5. *L'Etat et ses Limites.* Par ED. LABOULAYE.

6. *Le Prix de Boston.* Paris.

7. *Les Frères à l'Academie.* Paris.

IN allowing ourselves to be persuaded to insert in our last number an article designed to vindicate the character of Pope Alexander VI., we felt it due both to our readers and to ourselves to say frankly, that we regarded the Borgia pontiff as utterly incapable of vindication. This being our unalterable conviction, we did not hesitate to reject the article alluded to, on having carefully perused it.

In the present case all the circumstances are different. But one word more of Roderick Borgia, before we turn our attention to Jean Baptiste de la Salle, and ask our readers to appreciate the contrast between this particular Abbé and this particular Pope—between the ecclesiastic who was content to live and die an instructor of youth, and the ecclesiastic who, not content with calling himself the vicegerent of Christ and successor of St. Peter, claimed the right to bestow kingdoms or empires on his favorites.

To us a vindication of Alexander VI. seemed no more laudable a task than a vindication of Nero; and certainly we regarded the former performance as not less impossible than the latter. When earnestly requested, however, or rather importuned to open our pages to such an historical discussion, we comply, but beg leave very decidedly, as has been seen, not to adopt the pious view of our correspondent. But in declining to place ourselves in the position of a false witness by presenting to our readers as an infallible saint one whom we regarded much more as an incorrigible sinner, we abstained as much as possible from saying anything which enlightened Roman Catholics should regard as a reflection on their religion or church. And it is but justice to the latter class to say that they have evidently regarded our course in that light.

But unhappily the enlightened form but a small minority in this country, especially in the diocese of New York; and, accordingly, we are as much abused as we could have been had it been our hand, and not the pontiff's own, that mixed the poison of which the Borgia Pope is said to have died. We do not complain of this, however; we are quite aware that it can do us no harm. The Catholic, as well as the Protestant readers of the National Quarterly, cannot but regard it as entirely consistent, that a Catholic organ which gravely recommends the importation into the United States of the holy water of Lourdes, to be sold at two dollars a bottle, for pious purposes, should abuse us fish-woman-like, partly for refusing to accept Roderick Borgia as an immaculate, infallible saint, and partly for our inability to appreciate the profound learning and exalted piety of such "venerated prelatess" a the Corrigans, the McQuades, etc. Nor is it any fault of ours, if this intelligent class of Catholics think that the conductor of the Catholic organ alluded to would throw mud and garbage at any heretic, though once a heretic himself, for the price of one gallon, at retail, of the holy water of Lourdes, or for one bottle, imperial measure, of Irish whiskey.*

---

* It is but justice to say, that, so far as we are aware, none of the more respectable class of Catholic journals, such as the Baltimore Mirror, Boston Pilot, Philadelphia Standard, and Philadelphia Record, have ever abused us. On the contrary, no Protestant journals have complimented us more highly. We could hardly expect that even such enlightened and liberal Catholic journals would expressly commend the course forced on us in regard to Alexander VI.; but their silence on the subject is commendation enough. It certainly may be regarded as a frank, honest admission of the truth. Then we will take two of the most liberal and most intelligent Protestant journals in the United States as an index of the estimate of the latter class. Thus, the Philadelphia *North American*, whose literary department is always managed by a liberal scholar, says that in our preface we give "expression to the enlightened sense of Christendom, Catholic as well as Protestant." The Boston *Globe*, a journal of a similarly high character, whose literary department is, we are assured, in the hands of one of the ablest and most eminent critics of New England—a well-known author and orator, as well as a critic—disposes of the same article as follows:

"Two articles have given us great amusement, that on 'The Puffing Element in American Literature,' and that on 'Pope Alexander VI.' The latter reminds us of Sydney Smith's comments on Niebuhr's History of Rome: 'Have you heard of Niebuhr's discoveries? All Roman history reversed; Tarquin turning out an excellent family man, and Lucretia a very doubtful character, whom Lady ——— would not have visited.' In the rehabilitation of historical personages, we are perfectly willing to admit that much injustice has been done to Tiberius, Nero, and Henry the Eighth; but we clung to Pope Alexander as our favorite monster. It seems, however, that this good prelate has been outrageously abused. Hereafter we must look on the Borgias as vigorous philanthropists. We have read the article with roars of—we trust—innocent laughter. There is something in American Roman Catholics which strangely distinguishes them from their Italian brethren who profess the same faith. *They can swallow anything;* the Italian variety of the species is more critical. Still, we patriotically stand by our countrymen, and shall hereafter inscribe Pope Alexander on the list of our saints. There are ugly charges against him, such as licentiousness, incest, and murder, but we concede that the writer in the National Quarterly has shown that they are ill-founded. It is to be said that the editor of the Review, Dr. Sears, while *consenting to print the article, emphatically repudiates its conclusions.* He, as a thinker and scholar, is inclined to the common opinion of civilized mankind that Alexander was a scamp rather than a saint."

Now we take leave of Alexander VI. and his worthy champion, and turn our attention, for a moment, to the article for which we intend these remarks as an introduction. While we should be heartily ashamed had we permitted ourselves to become a party, even by implication, to the rehabilitation or vindication of Roderick Borgia, we readily admit that too much cannot be said in favor of Jean Baptiste de la Salle. But had we accepted the former as a saint, what impartial, intelligent man or woman could have regarded the present article in any other light than as a "whitewashing" performance?

No doubt, interested parties will tell us that we make this distinction, because the followers of De la Salle have so long been our patrons and friends. But it is not so. We certainly appreciate their friendship, and are thankful for their patronage. But when or where have we been the champion of a sham of any kind, for any consideration whatever? In what instance have we acted, even in our poorest days, like the poor apothecary, who sells the fatal drug destined to destroy, or at least endanger life, for no better reason than that he wants the money? It is not, then, for their patronage, but for their genuine, unpretending worth that we have on various occasions invited the attention of our readers, Catholic as well as Protestant, to the educational labors of the Christian Brothers.

Had patronage or lucre been our ruling motive, we would not have said one word in favor of any Catholic order. But since we have always been willing, nevertheless, to bestow the meed of praise wherever we thought it deserved, if we permitted our opinions to be warped by money, the Jesuits, and not the Christian Brothers, would have been our favorites. For, be it remembered that the good Fathers were the first of all Catholic orders to patronize us. Before we had any personal knowledge of the Christian Brothers, the disciples of Loyola had not only given us patronage but made us magnificent offers. But we soon find that in order to make our fortune in this way, we must have no opinions of our own; we must think as we are bid; we must be ready to believe anything and everything. Above all things we must maintain stoutly that the learning of the Jesuits is unfathomable, and that all other Catholic orders engaged in teaching, but especially the Christian Brothers, are but ignorant poachers on the rightful domain of the Jesuits!

All this being too strong a dose for us, we decline again and again to swallow it; we decline it even when strongly recommended by bishops and archbishops; nay, we decline it at the hands of fair and accomplished ladies, who in their own winning way say in substance "Do, dear Quarterly, it will do you so much good." Having been thus duly warned in every form, of course we have no reason to be either surprised or offended when we see not only one fine Jesuit prospectus after another withdrawn from our pages, but also every other prospectus over which the good Fathers have any influence, until there is not one left—not even that of the great Catholic tailors, whose peculiar mode of tailoring has cost the tax-payers of New York millions, and who with a part of this money have established scholarships at St. Xavier's College, in this city, by way of rewarding those pious and learned men for their kind, softening influence on our politicians!

Other Catholic orders have adorned our advertising pages with their university, college, academy, and seminary prospectuses in a similar manner, and for similar reasons they have withdrawn them in disgust—the period during which the prospectus was obliged to remain in each case being more or less exactly proportioned to the amount of intelligence, enlightment and liberality of sentiment of the party who inserted it. It would probably be more correct to say that the prospectus was withdrawn in each case more or less abruptly, according as the party who inserted it were more or less bigoted, superstitious, and intolerant, and made their noise in the world more or less like that of empty vessels! *

But the Christian Brothers, far from attempting to master

---

* We cannot say that we are much surprised to learn that one of the most pretentious of these institutions has recently established a "chair," or shop for the sale, to the faithful, of the holy water of Lourdes. It is almost needless to remark that a student armed with a bottle of this water and a diploma of proper size, countersigned by the *Professeur de Dance*, can hardly fail to make his mark in the world.

or muzzle us, or to dictate to us in any manner, have never to this day attempted to control our views in regard either to themselves or their rivals. In a word, they have never interfered with our criticisms in any way whatever. We have ever found them the friends rather than the opponents of free discussion. Instead of casting around their colleges or academies any mantle of secrecy or mystery, they have always invited Protestants as well as Catholics, not only to be present at their recitations, but also to examine their students. And that they have no prejudice whatever against Protestants is sufficiently proved by the fact that they always employ Protestant professors in their colleges; and if they make any distinction in doing so, it consists in their treating their heretical professors still more kindly and more generously, if possible, than their orthodox professors.

There are one or two other circumstances which we confess have strongly contributed to induce us to prefer the Christian Brothers to all other orders of the Catholic Church. They have never taken part, directly or indirectly, in any part of the world, in persecuting their heretical fellow-subjects or fellow-citizens on account of their heresy, but have ever been as much opposed to such persecution as the heretics themselves. Their hands have never been sullied by any dirty work. Even in New York, where it was scarcely necessary for any Catholic order to ask money, if they would only agree to influence those who do the voting, the Christian Brothers, very unlike their Jesuit rivals, have persistently declined to receive any part of the money of which our citizens have, from time to time, been plundered.

Such are our reasons for presenting the following article, written by a thoroughly educated, liberal-minded Catholic, to the consideration of our readers, without objecting to any part of it, but on the contrary bearing cheerful testimony to the truth and justice of its most essential statements. As we concluded our preface to the Borgia article with a scrap of the Church language, we may be permitted to do likewise in the case of De la Salle. But the signification must be very different, for well may the Catholics of this region exclaim at the present day, notwithstanding the lofty pretensions of our Jesuits—

> Rari quippe boni; numero sunt totidem, quot
> Thebarum portæ, vel divitis ostia Nili.

To THOSE who seek encouragement in the work of improving the condition of mankind, there is no more consoling study than that of the lives of the noble men and virtuous women who have gone before them and led the way. The more marked the influence, the greater pleasure must we feel in studying the causes which have brought it about. When the individual characteristics have fastened themselves upon a system either original or greatly improved, then the subject of such improvement becomes a study worthy the attention of every student of moral science. Under all these aspects we shall find that the world has not failed to give us many and striking illustrations. Previous to the Reformation we could look for such, omitting the ancients, only in the old Church. Since the division of sentiment in the religious world, the same sublime spectacle of men and women who are fit subjects of study has continued to present itself. So long as man remains in his present imperfect condition, so long will his physical wants and intellectual necessities call for the earnest and intelligent efforts of those whom we are justified in calling benefactors of mankind. When these benefactors show their superior ability by attacking the evils of society in their incipiency, and by devoting their chief attention to youth, then it is that, in our opinion, they are doubly worthy our attention and study. We believe ourselves justified, therefore, in presenting to our readers for their consideration and admiration, Jean Baptiste de la Salle, founder of the Institute of the Christian Brothers.

"Next to speech," says Lacordaire, "silence is the greatest power in the world." In this age of self-laudation, let it be permitted one who has seen the use which has been made of silence, as a power, to employ in favor of those who use it the still greater power of speech. The cause which the Christian Brothers embrace, the object most dear to their hearts, is one which affects society in its foundation, and which at the present moment is engaging the attention of minds intelligent and interested enough to foresee the dangers which threaten the onward march of Christian intelligence, and the means to be adopted for the arming of the masses against those dangers. Great men appear great only through the work which has procured for them the title, so that, in speaking of the Christian Brothers, we shall be giving the best record of their venerable Founder, of whom, however, we shall have a word to say as we proceed.

Jean Baptiste de la Salle was born at Rheims, France, April 30th, 1651. His family was among the most distinguished in the country, and his name is found connected with some of the most eminent early explorers, or missionaries, in the New World. Marquette the Jesuit was connected with La Salle, Rose de la Salle, a relative of Jean Baptiste, being his mother; and in the French army which aided in securing American independence, there were no less than three Marquettes, who gave their lives for the cause. It will be considered a coincidence that in another way the Abbé la Salle did like his relatives; for, as we shall show, while the former preached in the New World, or fought its battles against the reigning powers, the latter sent his children to preach by teaching, and to conquer, in bloodless but equally honorable warfare, the intellectual supremacy of our land.

To those acquainted with the routine of college life, it were useless to detail the little incidents which marked the years of even so distinguished a student as De la Salle. It may be sufficient to say that he studied so well, and became so prominent an apostle of truth, that he was not considered afterward an unfit instrument to oppose, by the founding of a new order of teachers, the vicious doctrines of that many-sided character, Voltaire, who wrote about the same time, that it was necessary to have the middle or lower classes comparatively ignorant. While yet a student, De la Salle obtained many marks of confidence from the directors of the seminary, the principal of whom has left this testimony. "M. de la Salle was always a faithful observer of the rules; * * * his conversation was always pleasing and becoming; he seems never to have given offence to any one, nor incurred any one's censure." * * * *

The man who was afterward to endure such harsh treatment from those who should have most assisted him, became self-reliant at an early age, owing to the decease of his parents. To this early-induced confidence in his own powers, and to the necessary trials attending his early self-direction, we must in great part ascribe that "iron will" which, a distinguished writer says, was the characteristic feature of the subject of this sketch.

Several ecclesiastical appointments were offered De la Salle, so soon as his age would allow, but he chose one in which there would be much less honor than labor. At twenty-seven he became a priest, and from that moment he devoted himself exclusively to the practice of good works, which led to the advantage of his neighbor. Though most affectionate towards his relatives, his sense of justice caused him to give positions within his control, not to his friends, but to the poorest clerics who could prove their claims to superior talent and integrity. His ideas of the priestly state were those since expressed by Lacordaire, a member of one of the most distinguished orders in the Catholic Church. Lacordaire says: "He who is called to the priestly office is he who feels in his heart the value and beauty of souls. Priests are bad or mediocre, simply because they enter upon the office with some other thought than that of self-sacrifice to the mystery of redemption. All other deficiencies may be remedied; nothing will avail if this be wanting."

De la Salle was aware that "there is no ignorance more deplorable than that exhibited in the failure to apply knowledge," and he equally knew that "where faith disappears, there credulity abounds." His object then became to so shape his life that the varied and extensive knowledge he

---

* *The True Friend of Youth.*

had acquired should be applied to the most useful purposes; and that these purposes, as well as the knowledge which directed them, should be founded on faith, that faith without which it is "impossible to please God." His position led him to be a close observer of humanity in its early stages. While assistant pastor, he was likewise charged with the superintendence of an institute for young ladies. Gradually, the conviction grew upon him that the existing methods of instruction were faulty, and being not only a speculative, but likewise practical observer, he undertook to supply, in his own person, the model of an accomplished teacher. All this occurred within a few years of his ordination, for, at thirty, he had entered upon his life's work, and shortly afterwards beheld himself the founder of a religious order, which he established so solidly, that from day to day its good reputation has been on the increase, till now its members, far from being degenerate, are more valued than any of their predecessors. The Christian Brothers rely not on the laurels won by those who have preceded them; they wear no borrowed wreaths, but in their own living and present work best proclaim the virility of the genius within their organization. Let those who depend for success on the reputation of their ancestors bear in mind the remarkable words of one of Europe's most remarkable prelates: "Without individual worth, the fruit of assiduous labor, the heirs of old races can only bend beneath the weight of their great name."*

We have said that at thirty De la Salle found himself at the head of a religious order. Let it not be imagined that his work was then completed. The possessor of the mantle of Augustin and Benedict, he had to cross the sea of trouble, encouraged only by the conviction that he had a mission to accomplish. He was at this time passing through an ordeal which, in one way or another, has met every man sufficiently courageous and intelligent to outstep the routine pursued by his neighbors, and to trace for himself some untrodden path to fame—a path consonant with the exalted ideas and the noble heart God had implanted within him. "The Abbé de la Salle," says Jacques Droz, "is to my mind the type of the great modest man; the utility of his pursuit, the continuity of his ideas, the perseverance of his devotedness, all concur to render him one of the most worthy models to be presented to humanity. His statue should be erected by grateful France." M. Vacquier de Traversa thus concludes an epitome of the life and labors of La Salle: "The city of Rouen should feel proud to see elevated in one of her public squares a monument to that man whose life, full of faith and of devotedness, was a work of patience, renunciation, and abnegation."

---

* Mgr. Dupanloup, *Haut Educ. Intell.*

It is a strange commentary on human intelligence that any attempt at going beyond what has already been done is sure to attract the criticism, if not the ridicule, of the world. The more this movement is directed to the moral amelioration of the race, the more certainly will abuse and vituperation assail the undertaking. Were this the case only where public corruption or official delinquency is concerned, we might pass the matter unnoticed. The fact is, however, that ecclesiastical history offers no exception to the part which spectators are pleased to play in reference to those who undertake some great reform. Thus the Abbé de la Salle found himself attacked on all sides. Priests who should have been the first to encourage him sneered in many cases at his efforts, while others took the liberty of absolutely thwarting his efforts. "Obstacles of every kind were thrown in the way of the establishment of his schools. They calumniated him and instituted legal proceedings against him, * * * and for twenty years he had to struggle against all those obstacles by which ignorance, interest, and bad faith recompense the man of genius for his services to his fellow-men." "A conduct so edifying would have merited eulogiums for any other than De la Salle; but a man whom God called already to a life of suffering and tribulation had early to accustom himself to see his actions ill-interpreted, often even calumniated." * That he might be in a position absolutely to convince his followers of his trust in Providence, he gave up his patrimony, distributing 40,000 francs to the poor, and from that time relied entirely on his efforts, blessed as they were, for success. "The famine which raged in 1684 furnished him with a favorable opportunity for stripping himself of his patrimony. * * * Then it was that his disciples, touched by such abandonment to Divine Providence, ceased to be anxious for the future." * Still, by these examples of abnegation, he had not softened his persecutors. Some called him an enthusiast, with a great deal of self-conceit and considerable strong-headedness; others took the more complacent task of advising him. The Jansenists were very powerful at this time, and, in illustration of the value placed upon the Abbé's influence, it may be mentioned that the offer of a bishopic was made him, if he would join their party.

---

* *The True Friend of Youth.*

Another party held that the teaching of youth could be undertaken by somebody else. It was not necessary for the descendant of one of the noblest families in France to undertake so ungrateful a task. Like all men destined for great ends, La Salle allowed these people to talk; he working in the meantime at the object which he had assumed as his life-work. It were useless to say more on the individual characteristics of the Abbé De la Salle. The most practical way to describe a tree, as a producing agent, is to tell of its fruit. In like manner, to talk of a man, who has undertaken a great work for his fellow-men, the best way is to say what he has accomplished, and the means he took to succeed. The life of the Abbé De la Salle was devoted entirely to the education of youth in France, and what more noble object could he pursue? Let us bear in mind that he meant *to educate*, not simply to instruct, the youth of his native land.

To understand the Abbé's views, the safest way will be to employ his expressions and give his sentiments, as contained in his published writings, and then see how far his ideas have been carried out by his successors. There is no difficulty whatever experienced in obtaining a copy of any of the

---

* *The True Friend of Youth.*

Brothers' books—a proof that they contain no state secrets, and ample evidence that the Brothers are not afraid to have the lives they lead compared with the rules they profess to follow. We find in the second chapter of their rules that "The Brothers shall have a most profound respect for the sacred Scriptures, and shall pass no day without reading a certain portion of it."* Here we see that De la Salle met the reformers on their own ground, and asserted that, so far as he and his were concerned, there could be no truth in the assertion that to Catholics the sacred volume was a sealed book.

The object of the Society of the Christian Brothers, the founder states to be "the education of youth," the term youth not meaning, as some pretend, only the poor, or the very young, but all classes of youths that may present themselves for instruction and education. Thus, take the well-known instance which occurred during the lifé of the founder. King James II. of England, having been obliged to retire into France, was followed by several Irish noblemen with their sons. The latter needed instruction, and though there were other institutions in which the young gentlemen could have been educated, still, after consultation, at the suggestion of Louis XIV,, and with the approbation of the Archbishop, it was resolved to give them in charge to the Abbé De la Salle.† Thus, at the very outset of his society, he showed conclusively, by his taking charge of the education of these young men, that his order, as a teaching body, was not destined only for the instruction of small children or primary classes. "De la Salle opened the first normal schools for district teachers, and inaugurated classes wherein, on Sundays, between the church services, lessons in reading, writing, arithmetic, drawing and architecture, were given to young men or mechanics who desired to complete their instruction."

---

* So true is this, that studying Bible history and committing the sacred text to memory are obligatory studies in the Brothers' classes. So much for the solution of the "Bible reading" question, which so agitates our people periodically. The Christian Brothers go farther in this respect than any public school in this country.

† Um diese Zeit erhielt La Salle eines Tages den Besuch des Pfarrers von St. Sulpice, welcher im Auftrage des Erzbischofs von Paris zu ihm kam. Dieser Prälat, welcher im Jahre 1700 zur Kardinalswürde erhoben worden war, hegte stets eine grosse Verehrung gegen den Diener Gottes und wollte eine sich jetzt darbietende Gelegenheit benutzen, ihm hiervon einen neuen und offenbaren Beweis zu liefern. Jacob II., der unglückliche König von England, hielt sich nämlich damals gerade in Frankreich auf, wo er bei Ludwig XIV. die gastfreundlichste Aufnahme fand. Als dieser Fürst erfahren hatte, dass 50 junge Irländer, welche durch die Verfolgung ihr Vaterland verlassen mussten, nach Paris gekommen seien, um dort ein Asyl zu suchen, wandte er sich an den Kardinal-Erzbischop mit der Bitte, diesen jungen Flüchtlingen in irgend einer Anstalt ein Unterkommen zu verschaffen;

There are few clearer indications of the liberality of one's views than his expression of what he believes to be the rights of the middle classes on the only days at their command. The Puritan idea is, that listening to a sermon and reading the Bible shall occupy the Sunday, while the more liberal Christian believes that after service the son of labor may amuse himself rationally, or even devote his spare hours to mental improvement. As early as 1705, in which year La Salle opened these Sunday schools, he had better understood and more completly provided for the instruction and improvement of tradesmen than all the unions and associations of our day.

Again we read in a circular letter addressed by a chapter or convention of the order to the Brothers, that though the latter are required to teach gratuitously, this does not prevent them from receiving remuneration when they give the children cares and attentions which, if not rendered by them, would have to be given at home, or elsewhere. Thus it was that the founder himself understood his own regulations, and on such grounds he achieved a success so great that, as his biographers tell us, at his death in 1719, "he left twenty-two houses where reigned the piety with which he had inspired them; and at the Revolution in 1789, the number of houses had increased to one hundred and twenty-one, or an average increase of four new establishments every three years." When the Revolution came, it found the Brothers superior to

---

dieser dachte gleich an La Salle und beauftragte den Pfarrer von St. Sulpice, diese Sache dem Diener Gottes vorzutragen.—*Leben des ehrwürdigen Dieners Gottes Johann Baptist de La Salle, Stifters des Ordens der christlichen Schulbrüder.* Bearbeitet von P. Jos. Aloys Krebs. Regensburg, 1859.

its rage. While ministers of Catholic worship were forced to abandon their churches, being driven, in many cases, on board the hulks, at Brest, awaiting transportation, the Brothers, likewise condemned to banishment, still carried out the spirit of their order by teaching those clergymen the higher mathematics and kindred sciences, which the good fathers were happy to learn. When the Revolution had destroyed itself, many of the Catholic colleges were re-established, but it was thought by the directors of public instruction that the services of the Brothers might be dispensed with in the higher educational houses of the city of Marseilles. The merchants and principal business men, who had been educated by the Christian Brothers, thought otherwise, and by protest and petition so influenced the government of Louis Philippe that their seminary was restored.

We should not wonder that Benedict XIII., a Pope whose memory history honors itself by honoring, considered it one of his grandest acts that he had approved of the Christian Brothers, as a body he foresaw was to do so much good. How deep-laid the foundations of a work which has since assumed such magnificent proportions! Previous to his death in 1719, the Abbé De la Salle had devoted forty years of his life to the laying of these foundations. Excellent as the regulations he had made, and fruitful as he knew these regulations would prove if followed, we can scarcely suppose that he could have formed any adequate idea of the actual extent which his Institute was to embrace. In the natural order of things, the founder could scarcely have anticipated the success which has since crowned his efforts. Could the Abbé, who died with the censure of his bishop hanging over him, hope that the Church would afterward espouse his cause, and that of his followers? Let us remember that the jealousy of his clerical neighbors had gone so far that one paid him in *counterfeit money* for the services of some Brothers; another had appeared among the Brothers, and had promised them all sorts of advantages if they would separate themselves from their founder, and even the most virtuous persons, deceived by the enemies of the holy man, have attributed to him the faults of his disciples.

That his cup of sorrow might be filled, some of his own followers had abandoned him, while others had gone so far as to refuse him admittance, when travelling on a tour of inspection. When the Abbé's teachers succeeded so well that they excited the anger of jealous rivals, he bowed to the unjust sentence which fined him and his, because they had done their work so well that they had attracted to their humble beginnings the attention of the more opulent classes. All these difficulties had retarded, but not overpowered, the Abbé in his struggles for the improvement of the existing methods of instruction. Hence, as we have said, it would have been natural for the Abbé to have mistrusted the after-success of his undertaking. But such difficulties are the food upon which great minds thrive, and if so, the mind of the Abbé must have been great indeed. Were men to see in advance the success which is to crown their efforts, perhaps the gratification thus afforded would distract them from the great works undertaken. To Christian minds, the conviction that good is to be done, is the only stimulus needed to urge them to its accomplishment. Rising above the mere personal name or reward to be achieved, they lose their personality, which becomes absorbed in their entire concentration upon their assumed task. Such, to our mind, were the motives of the Abbé De la Salle. History, in his case has justified what jealousy sought to disparage. A bishop was among the last who thwarted the designs of the Abbé De la Salle in his lifetime; to-day a bishop is the first to head a list for the purpose of raising a monument to "The True Friend of Youth." Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, had contradicted and spurned the "reformer," as he was called, and had cut the Abbé off from his functions, and within the last month the present Archbishop of Paris has sent 500 fr. as a contribution towards the monument fund, and established among his clergy a committee to collect funds for the same laudable end! *

Bishops were among the most ready to hear accusations

---

* "His Lordship, the Archbishop of Paris, not content with sending 500 francs as a subscription, has also established a committee of which the Abbé M. Laugenieux, vicar-general, has been named president." *La Semaine Religieuse*, 21 December, 1872.

against this good man; within the last few years, one of the greatest theologians of the century, Cardinal Gousset, made two voyages to Rome, there to defend the fair name of the man he had learned to appreciate.

The founding of a religious order implies much more than the generality of readers would suppose. It calls for an insight into certain contingencies of the future which only the keenest perception can detect. This perception the Abbé De la Salle possessed in a remarkable degree. We will mention but one point in the regulations he made: that *no priest should at any time become a member of the Society*, and that it shall at all times be *governed by one of its own members*. The wisdom of this regulation has been demonstrated a thousand times. De la Salle knew, that while prelates or priests may be excellent administrators of a diocese or parish, in which they are not brought into close contact with their inferiors, they might, and probably would, fail completely, in the administration of the affairs of a religious body, or a school containing many classes. So determined was he on this point, that some time before his death he insisted that his resignation should be accepted. It was only when, by the powerful reasons he had advanced, the Brothers became convinced of the wisdom of his proposition, that they consented to accept his resignation.

We cannot do more, in referring to the Brothers in France, than to say that they have accomplished wonders. This success is due to three things. The Institute is a perfect democracy. It makes its own laws, and elects its own officers. Political economists universally admit that intelligence is the first element of success in a democracy, and republics only fail where ignorance rules the hour. The system pursued by the Brothers in teaching is founded upon the experience of thousands of its teachers during nearly two centuries.*

---

* "The method of the Brothers is all that is most astonishing, and most profoundly wise. It has been tried and improved, perfected and adapted to every need, and it is not the work of any individual experience; it is that of thousands of practical men—men who have lived and grown old in the work. Men who have died in the service of youth have brought thereto the fruits of their observations and the results of their experience." * * —*Minérve.*

We cannot refrain from inserting here the testimony of Dr. M. Strack, of Brandenburg. The source from which the praise proceeds renders it all the more acceptable. "The Church in France establishes, maintains, and superintends religious orders, the members of which devote themselves unreservedly and exclusively to the education of youth. In this they find their sole happiness on earth, renouncing willingly all earthly goods to live but for the accomplishment of their self-imposed duties. To this class of persons belong especially the Christian Brothers. Whatever praises we have bestowed on the present French educational system, the fullest meed belongs to the schools of the Christian Brothers."

If from Europe we follow the Christian Brothers to America, we shall find the same magnificent report of their work. When liberty was first understood in the United States, then did the Brothers first take a foothold. Le Play says, in referring to Maryland: "This sentiment (religious liberty) was especially insisted upon by the Quakers, who refused it only to Indians remaining in paganism. It also especially existed among the Catholics of Maryland, who refused it to none."

The Brothers rank among the most liberal-minded teachers in the world. Avoiding any criticism of their neighbors, they work on in the modest manner which is their characteristic feature. Leaving questions yet disputed in the domain to which they still belong, the Brothers make it a rule to bear no part in the wrangles which sometimes take place on points upon which, their Church having not yet spoken, men have no right to decide. Limiting themselves to the sphere which is their own, they leave to their more ambitious rivals the task of showing how far charity may be wounded even under the pretext of proving one's superiority. Satisfied with their own success, they prove themselves truly liberal by not annoying, still less endeavoring to thwart the success of others. Thus do they combine within themselves *the simplicity which attracts, the liberality which secures, and the charity and kindness which retain friends.*

When we hear persons who profess to be witty adducing arguments against this neutral ground which the Brothers take in political and religious discussions, we cannot help recalling a saying of one of Notre Dame's greatest orators: "Gentlemen, God has made you witty, very witty indeed, to show you how little he values the wit of men." Because of this neutrality in such questions the Brothers are highly prized by our most intelligent prelates in America, where work, and not talk, is needed.* Archbishop Eccleston, in a circular letter addressed to his clergy and people in 1846, says:

> "I am grateful to divine Providence to be enabled to inform the Rev. Clergy and laity of the diocese that the Christian Brothers have extended to us the advantage of their holy and admirable institution. Their first novitiate and school have been opened in this city (Baltimore) in Calvert Hall, and are, I trust, but the precursors of many others throughout the United States.
>
> "† SAMUEL, Abp. Balt.
>
> "BALTIMORE, November 13, 1846."

Referring to the above appeal, we may say, to the honor of the Christian Brothers, that neither in this country nor elsewhere *have their hands been soiled by help from those whose assistance could be but an exchange of commodity*—money for influence. The Brothers believe that "the gods help those who first help themselves," and, acting upon this motto, they earn their bread literally by the sweat of their brow, leaving to others, who may so elect, to make life easier by *accepting largesses from those who in their days of prosperity can well afford to divide.* And why have they thus universally eschewed any mixing up with political tricksters? The reason may be found in this, that they imitate their founder, of whom Huguet writes: "If we remark of each of his undertakings, we shall perceive, not without surprise, that he never did anything to procure for himself the protection of the authorities."†

---

* **Memoir of Lacordaire. Montalembert.**

† **"Si l'on fait attention à chacune de ses démarches, on remarquera, non sans étonnement, qu'il n'en fit jamais aucune pour se procurer la protection de l'autorité." (Huguet, sur l'Esperance.)**

We may also ascribe this honorable independence to the fact that they live up to the practice of the Gospel, whose tenets they have embraced. "The practice of the greatness of the Gospel," says Lacordaire, "is incompatible with meanness of character. It is well that we should know what we mean by making Christians; whether for us man is the *homo* whom the ancients derived from *humus*, earth, slime; or the *vir*, the man who is something more than earth, who has courage, soul, virtue, *virtus*." * * *

A great part of the success obtained by the Christian Brothers is due to their perfectly understanding the wants of the people. "The height of ability consists in a thorough knowledge of the real value of things, and of the genius of the age in which we live."* Taking this as a criterion of the ability of the Christian Brothers, let us place before our readers the opinion of a distinguished member of the English Parliament, the late John Francis Maguire:

> "These men are the inheritors of one of the best educational systems in the world, and, devoting themselves exclusively to their self-imposed task, their success is necessarily great. Their parochial schools vie with the public schools in the excellency of their teaching—that is, in mere secular knowledge; and their high-schools, academies, and colleges rival any corresponding institutions supported by the State. The proficiency of their pupils in the highest branches of polite learning is the theme of admiration in journals of the most marked Protestant character; and delighted Americans of various denominations admit the service these men render to society through the influence of their teaching on the rising youth of the country. The Brothers are eminently practical; they thoroughly comprehend the genius and the spirit of the American people, and they so teach their pupils, rich and poor, as to suit them to the position they are to occupy in life."

The above is but a small part of a most enthusiastic tribute to the Brothers. To it must be added the endorsement of Archbishop Hughes. Though an Irishman by birth, every pulsation of his heart beat for the best interests of America. He was, in fact, the pet of Americans of all denominations, who admired his pluck, respected his piety, and consulted his large experience and great common sense. What were his relations with the Brothers? He was one of the first to declare openly that they were to take charge of whatever schools, high or low, which they thought proper, and were fit to teach.* De Courcey, referring to this, says: "The Academy of the Holy Infancy (now Manhattan College), put in operation in 1853, owes its existences to his devotedness, and crowns the work of the order."

---

* La Rochfoucauld.

Two other distinguished prelates also openly asserted that there was to be no exception of persons where the education of the people was concerned. The learned Archbishop Kenrick, of Baltimore, and the venerable Archbishop Blanchet, of New Orleans, declared it their wish that the Brothers should take charge of academies and colleges in which the youth of America might receive a complete education. And yet we have heard it repeatedly asserted that the Brothers have gone out of their sphere in assuming the direction of such institutions! The slightest reflection will show the absurdity of the opinion held by some selfish parties belonging to their own Church concerning the Brothers' having charge of academies and colleges. They say that the Brothers were established especially for the poor or middle class. Granted. What does this prove? Christ says in the New Testament, an authority which the cavillers profess to respect, "Blessed are the poor in spirit—for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven;" and in answering the disciples whom John had sent him he replied, "Go tell your master what you have seen. The blind see, the lame walk," etc., "and the poor have the Gospel preached to them." Here mention is made particularly of the poor, as having the Gospel preached to them. Shall we then rashly conclude that the rich were not to hear the divine word? The conclusion would be just as logical as that which some seek to found on the assumption that the Brothers were principally established for the instruction of the poor.

---

* Archbishop Hughes was always one of the most powerful and active promoters of these foundations. (Les Frères en Amerique.)

Then why should the Brothers alone be expected to observe in America all those regulations which were made, many of them at least, to suit Europe? Even admitting that the Brothers in Europe teach only common schools, this could not be a reason for their only doing the same in this country. Thus, we know one order that was originally intended never to control parishes, which to-day manages, to the great chagrin of many secular priests, some of the finest districts in large cities. Another, destined to give missions among poor country people, is to-day in charge of the most numerous congregations and the largest churches in America! A rule which works well for all other orders settling in America can scarcely be supposed to be unsuitable to the Brothers alone.

No better rebuke can be offered to those cavillers than the old adage, that "such jealousy is the best evidence of lack of judgment." The champions of liberty everywhere have expressed themselves in favor of the Christian Brothers. No priest ever fought harder for the liberties of the Church than Lacordaire. The last time he raised his voice in Paris was in favor of this order.

No one who understands even the temporal welfare of the masses would feel otherwise than rejoiced at the increase of the number of the Catholic clergy in America. Strange to say, but true it is, that the Christian Brothers' colleges are to-day the great nurseries for Catholic theological seminaries. In a sermon lately preached by a reverend gentleman, who has not the Brothers in his parish, he declared that the subscriptions for the support of the diocesan seminary should now be more generous than in the past, for, since the Brothers have had time to educate a generation, the applicants for admission into the seminary in Troy equal the full capacity of the establishment. We hope we are not betraying any confidence when we say that we have learned, from a most reliable source, that the present distinguished bishop of Philadelphia, Rt. Rev. James F. Wood, D. D., declared, at a meeting held in the Christian Brothers' College of that city, that he did not wish all the Brothers' students sent to the theological seminary, that some should be kept for the Brothers' novitiate; for, said the learned gentleman, "*we need Brothers quite as much as we do priests.*"

Still the Brothers are far from being either narrow-minded or bigoted in their dealing with students of other denominations. Bigotry in the direction of a college would not be allowed, nor could it exist under that most liberal and generous of men, Brother Patrick, the present provincial of the order. One instance, known to us, will exemplify Brother Patrick's views on this matter. In Manhattan College there is always a large percentage of the students of various Protestant denominations, especially of the Episcopal Church. We have known there young men to be sent regularly, so long as they or their parents desired it, under proper guardianship, to their places of worship on Sunday.* This happened repeatedly during the presidency of Brother Patrick in Manhattan College. We do not know what the regulations are at present, but we are sure Brother Paulian has been too highly educated, and too long with Brother Patrick—indeed, he is far too enlightened and kind-hearted—to have any but the most liberal views on this subject.† In thus acting they prove themselves the best Catholics, for during the past twenty years the conversions to catholicity have been, not among the ignorant, but among such as have made Protestantism, in one form or another, the study of years. Not only do they interfere in no way with the religious tenets of their students, but among the professors employed by the Brothers, some are non-Catholic, thus verifying another saying of La Rochfoucauld: "He must be truly honest who is willing to be always open to the inspection of honest men." The same will apply to the

---

* As the College is conducted by the Christian Brothers, it is presumed that they need hardly assure the public that the utmost care is bestowed on the moral training of all committed to their care.

The religion of the non-Catholic portion of the pupils will not be interfered with in any manner, but facilities will be afforded those whose parents desire that they should attend their respective places of worship on Sunday. —*Catalogue, Man. Coll.*

† Our Jesuit friends, with that obliquity of logic characteristic of them, try to disparage everything great or good which they cannot claim as their own work. Thus it is, that because the Christian Brothers persistently refuse to be bigoted, superstitious, or intolerant, the good Fathers pretend that they are not orthodox, and consequently ought not to be sustained by those who are. If Protestant writers commend the good done by the Brothers, the Fathers find in the fact only new proof of their heterodoxy. But when have we, or any other Protestant writer spoken of the liberal-minded, cosmopolitan order of educators in language more highly commendatory than the following

---

extract from an elaborate article in the Dublin Freeman's Journal, the recognized organ of the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland:—

> "At present they have schools, academies and colleges, in all the great centres of thought and civilization in the great Republic. In New York alone they are conducting fifteen parochial schools, three first-class academies, and one college (Manhattan), *which is reputed to be* among the *highest* and *most successful* Catholic seats of learning in the whole States. A degree obtained in this college is considered by scholars of every religious denomination *a sufficient guarantee for superior talent and learning.* Enjoying all the privileges of a university, Manhattan College is the source of innumerable blessings to the sons of the wealthier classes in the States. The President, Brother Paulian, a gentleman of *great administrative abilities*, and *the highest literary culture and acquirements*, is a son of gallant Tipperary; he was born in Thurles; and the American Chrysostom, the Most Rev. Dr. Ryan, the Coadjutor Bishop of the Archdiocese of St. Louis, was his school-fellow and townsman. A few years ago it was the high privilege of Brother Paulian, as the President of Manhattan College, to confer the degree of LL.D. upon Dr. Ryan, in grateful acknowledgment of the young bishop's distinguished services to the cause of Christian education, and of the honor and fame which his electric eloquence reflected upon the Irish race. The Provincial of the Christian Brothers in the United States, Brother Patrick, is also a son of the same county, which has been as fertile of brave missionaries as of heroes and martyrs. It would be difficult to name, *either in the old or new world*, any Irishman who, *in a quiet and unostentatious manner*, has rendered during the last thirty years *nobler services* to the cause of Christian education than Brother Patrick. *Resolute*, *high-minded*, *far-sighted*, true as the needle to the pole to every ennobling tradition of his race, *he possesses the governing mind*, *and the calm*, *unconquerable courage* of a Hughes, a Kendrick, or an England. He is *justly called* the father and founder of the Christian Brothers in the United States."

Although we readily admit the truthfulness and justice of these commendations, we have never expressed our approbation of the efforts of those gentlemen, or our estimate of their talents and acquirements in language so comprehensive and emphatic. Not, indeed, but we have long felt they deserved it. We have abstained from doing so partly because we mean to be chary of praise, and partly because we know from experience that both the Provincial and the President mentioned much prefer "to do good by stealth," rather than seek any fame.—*Ed.*

constant invitation which the Brothers hold out to all interested in education to call at any time, either at examinations, or during school-hours, to question their students. Again, this employing of Protestant professors demonstrates that with the Brothers the merit of a professor, as a professor, is the only thing, apart from morality, which weighs in their estimation.

Jealous or illogical people seek to found an argument against the Brothers on the fact that they employ considerable secular help in their colleges and academies. That the Brothers excite such jealousy is the greatest compliment that can be paid them, for we are told that "only such persons as avoid causing jealousy are worthy of it."

Sometimes, say such critics, the Brothers employ those professors in the highest classes. It would be unjust to think evil of all who make these accusations, for we believe some do so in good faith, being impressed with these ideas, by others who should, and probably do, know better. Our view of the case is this: The Brothers are so much sought after by the more intelligent bishops and priests that they are obliged to distribute their numbers in many directions, giving sometimes little more than the required force to direct the establishments, leaving many of the classes to be filled by selected assistants. In many cases, where clergymen cannot receive a full quota of Brothers, they insist that at least some shall be sent to direct the schools. This holds true of parochial schools, as well as of colleges and academies. One of the finest Brothers' schools in the country is managed in this way, there being, we think, but three Brothers out of sixteen teachers. Were the services of the Brothers less in demand, it might be possible to have all the professorships filled by them. Under present circumstances it would be simply impossible. But supposing, as the fault-finders say, the Brothers take the liberty of teaching only certain branches, what does this prove? Why, just this, that *they do not pretend to know everything*, and do not think they can master all that they do not yet know. Being more honest than ambitious, they limit themselves to a certain number of studies which they completely master, leaving to selected professors the remaining branches. Taking even the malicious view of the case, which is sometimes suggested, that the Brothers are not capable men; even in this case, since they are honest enough to employ outside help when their opponents pretend they are not properly instructed themselves, the very act of so employing assistance prevents a confiding public from being a loser by misplaced (?) confidence.*

Again, in the highest classes, generally speaking, the number of students is quite small, and if Brothers taught these classes, they would be taken from the care of much larger numbers in the lower classes. We know that the earlier training is the keystone to after-progress. Any one can teach scholars who have been thoroughly grounded, for this preparation awakens love of science and desire to improve. With this preparation, teachers from without, who are competent to teach, but not to manage large numbers, find employment in every way suited to their ability. Where there is but a choice, the Brothers select the hard part of the work for themselves. In any case, then, it is clear that the Brothers act in a straightforward manner, and that their conduct will bear the closest scrutiny.

Since we have undertaken to speak thus far of the Brothers, let us be permitted to say a word about their taking charge of pay-schools of any grade; for some contend that they should not do so. We hold that, so far from going out of their sphere, they act only in keeping with the strictest justice. In the first place, Brothers never open such schools without the consent, nay, without the most urgent appeals and reiterated solicitations of the highest ecclesiastical authorities; hence, those in lower positions should have nothing to say in the matter. Supposing that the Brothers did not, for the first century and a half of their existence, take charge of those advanced, or pay-schools, what argument could be founded upon this assumption, against their now controlling such institutions? But the author of a resolution or law must be supposed to understand its spirit. Now, it is known that the Abbé De la Salle maintained his first novitiate by the proceeds from such schools. In whom should we have the greater confidence; in the physician who for the first twenty years of his profession limits himself to the study and practice of the elements of his calling, or to the charlatan who, at the very outset, pretends to cure all the ills to which flesh is heir? It would likewise be next to useless, save for personal gratification, that the Brothers should, as they are required, devote themselves to earnest and continued study, if they were only to teach primary schools. The same would apply to pastors who are placed in country parishes—should they limit themselves to the study of the parable of the husbandman, or the lesson of the vineyard? What of Copernicus, who in his country parish went so far beyond the needs of his parishoners that he afterwards revolutionized the existing system of astronomy?

---

* "The least that can be said of the Brothers is that that they are as able as secular teachers. Free from domestic trouble, they consecrate, each day, precious moments, to study. Moreover, they are not obliged, like seculars, to study without a guide, for they find among their Brothers men of ability in various specialties to instruct and in form them in science itself."—*Les Frèes en Amerique.*

Again, in this country, where the Brothers have to fight their way through every sort of opposition; where they have to support their own normal school, and where they have so persistently refused questionable aid, by what other means, save by their academies and colleges, could they meet the great demands upon them? It certainly could not be by means of the miserable pittance which they allow themselves in their free schools—a stipend so small, that were it not, we are told, for the academies generally attached to them, the Brothers could not meet their expenses. Who, with any sentiment of fair-play in his nature could object to so honorable a method, or course of action?

It is a well-ascertained fact that all religious bodies, not employed in teaching, and several that are, give the most unequivocal testimony to the Christian Brothers. Thus, the Rev. F. Müller, one of the most prominent members of the Redemptorist Society, is not afraid to declare in his "Public School Education," that "These men (the Brothers) are profoundly learned in all the sciences. They have abandoned home, friends, and have devoted themselves for a scanty support to the education of youth." The Abbé Gaume, the learned author of many works, and one of the most powerful writers on education, says: "God came to the succor of the faith by many religious congregations, especially that of the Christian Brothers." "Their founder," he says, "drew up rules far superior to those given by men of the world for the instruction of youth." The most prominent member of the Augustinian order in America, the Very Rev. P. E. Moriarty, in a recent article, bestows like praise on the Christian Brothers. One of the most learned of the clergy in the archdiocese of New York, a student of the Christian Brothers, and a most accomplished historian and antiquary, declared at a meeting of the Christian Brothers' schools, in Steinway Hall, in presence of various members of religious orders: "If we wish to save our children from the atmosphere of vice by which they are surrounded, let us educate them as Christians in a Christian school, taught by the Christian Brothers."

Dr. Barnard says: "Any description of popular education in Europe would be incomplete which would not give prominence to the Institute of the Christian Brothers, including in this term the earliest professional school for the training of teachers in Europe."

The opponents of the Christian Brothers pay them, indirectly, the greatest compliment, for they move heaven and earth, and then think the trouble well repaid if they can secure a few boys from the Brothers' common schools. Thus, without knowing it, do they give an eloquent testimony to the efficiency of the Brothers as teachers.

We had almost forgotten a terrible accusation which we have frequently heard made against the Christian Brothers:*

---

* Une preuve du cas que l'on fait de leur enseignement et de leurs livres classiques, c'est qu'en 1848 plusiers furent l'objet de contrefaçons; ainsi leur *Traité d' Arithmétique*, l' *Abrégé de l'Histoire du Canada* et l' *Abrégée Géographie*. Tout le monde s'accorde à dire qu'ils ont rendu un très-grand service à l'instruction par leurs livres classiques, bien rédigés et parfaitement adaptés à l'intelligence des enfants.—*Les Frères en Am.*

"They write no books." Well, the fact is that they have too much active work on hand to allow them time for book-making. It is false, however, to say that the Brothers write no books. Their present Superior-General has written no less than eight or ten different volumes, which have been translated into nearly all the modern languages. The Brothers in France have the best series of school-books ever published, and which American publishers would do well to study. Their system of drawing, as we have seen, is declared superior to all other methods, this having been decided at the late French Exhibition, where, as the president of the jury announced, the Brothers had saved the honor of France in the department under which drawing was classed. The Brothers in Canada have published, or are now publishing, all their own books. The Brothers in the United States have not as yet published any series of text-books, though they have issued several independent volumes. But what would be proved against the Brothers did they never publish a book? Do our best physicians, those having immense practice, publish many books? Is this department not rather taken up almost exclusively by the quacks and charlatans who infest the land? So much for the question of publishing books.* Thus we see that the slightest investigation of those high-sounding charges made against the Brothers, as a literary body, fail, when subjected to the logic of facts. Far from envying their neighbors in this or any other respect, the Brothers rejoice when they find the work in which they engage successfully pursued by others. Says the *Figaro:* "The Brothers claim no monopoly, not even that of self-sacrifice. Liberty to all, even to those who wish to give their blood and their vigils for their country, claiming in return only the right to do good."

Before concluding this paper, a few words may be allowed, in a journal which, without being the organ of any denomination, is open to the utterances of any seeking the improvement of mankind, on what many consider an objectionable feature in the Christian Brothers' method: we mean the prominence given to the religious instruction of their students. The experience of every day shows that instruction without religious training or education is a danger, rather than a blessing, to the members of a state or country. We have elsewhere quoted the words of Jules Simon on the subject. He will not be accused of partiality to religious views.

---

* Besides, many works are published by Brothers in France, under their own names, among which may be mentioned the learned and venerable works of Brother Ogerien on Mineralogy, reviewed in a former number of this journal. Within the last six months no less than four or five books have been issued by as many different Brothers.

Shall we then say that our children, our boys and girls, our young men and young women, shall not be instructed? Far from us be such a conclusion. But we will say: Let us have secular instruction, but not secular instruction alone. Let the tree of knowledge have for its roots the principles of religious truth. Thus we shall see on all sides the leaves of good example, and the still more acceptable fruit of good works. Let religion and science go hand in hand. What God has united let no man put asunder. Science is an emanation from the divinity. Let it then be subservient to, but accompanied by, its mistress—religion. Thus shall the world go on progressing, and thus shall we see carried into practical effect the result of the perfected system of the Christian Brothers, the disciples and followers of the Abbe de la Salle.

ART. V.—1. *Commentaries, Critical, Philological and Geographical, in Sundry Newspapers.* By the learned PROVOST and FACULTY of the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: December, January and February, 1873.

2. *A "So-Called Latin Letter," stamped with the Cabalistic or Hieroglyphic initials* N. Q. R., and *long supposed to be the production of an ancient Brahmin, but discovered recently by a learned Graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, after much profound research, to be the work of a spiteful and libellous Savage of the Bog species.* New York: 1871.

3. *An Essay on the Art of Growing Rich by* DEGREES, *as practised in the middle of the Nineteenth Century among the people called Quakers, with some Digressions on Natural History, Equipments, Gunnery, Materia Medica*, etc., etc. Manhattan: MDCCCLXXIII.

WE trust it is superfluous for us to say that it is in no boastful spirit we ask our readers of the Keystone State, especially those of the good Quaker City, whether our peculiar mode of treatment has not proved remarkably efficacious in the case of their most venerable patient. That it has made the old lady feel sadly uncomfortable for a month or more, is very true. It is also true that this is a much longer period of suffering than we had calculated upon. We had hoped that the effects of the cantharides, lancet, ipecacuanha, aloes, etc., would have all passed off in one week at farthest.

But be it remembered, in justice to us, that our venerable patient neither allowed us to feel her pulse, nor see her tongue. Since she thus concealed from us some of her worst symptoms, we think we may be excused for having taken it for granted that her case was not so serious as unhappily it has proved to be. Nothing is better understood among pathologists than that patients who are much debilitated from chronic disease cannot bear much of what some practitioners still call the antiphlogistic treatment. If from an imperfect diagnosis this treatment is carried to excess, there is danger that it will kill the patient; at best, in proportion as the constitution is weak, it is slow in recovering from the commotion produced in the system by such agencies as cathartics, scarifications, emetics, etc. This will account for the unusually protracted writhings of our illustrious Pennsylvania patient—writhings which, we trust we need hardly say, moved the bowels of compassion of none to a deeper pitch of tenderness than they did ours.

As for what the friends of the patients, or the patients themselves, say of the physician when alarming symptoms supervene as results of a certain mode of treatment, no sensible practitioner who understands his profession would be offended at it, or, indeed, take any notice of it. Hippocrates himself has been abused in such circumstances; especially in those in which the patient was rich, "venerable," and of the feminine gender! If, only to please a patient of this character, her friends and retainers are apt to wax indignant, and even call hard names; still more readily will those do so who claim to understand and practise the healing art themselves. Accordingly, who has not heard such comments as the following? "It was that last dose that did the mischief." "Why, he's no doctor—he's only a quack." "The fellow doesn't know how to write his own prescription—he has to employ somebody to write it for him!" "Oh, that's his own; but don't you see what horrible Latin?" "A blister, indeed, and to so delicate a part!" "But only think of scarifying the back of a lady upwards of a hundred years old!" "What a *savage!*" "Poor, dear grandmamma! what an outrage! If anything was the matter with the venerable lady, all she needed was a dose of salts and a dish of gruel, with perhaps some paregoric." "Grandmamma herself is not to blame for what she has suffered, for she has always had a laudable horror of those foreign ignoramuses." "That's so; she would call in none, if she were dying, but natives of our own *county*: at least they should belong to the State of Pennsylvannia." "Well, in New

York, too, there are some respectable physicians; but do you know this fellow has been exposed many a time for malpractice? Scarcely two years have elapsed since, in his ignorance and stupidity, he nearly caused the death of several eminent and worthy citizens. It is well known, for instance, that Messrs. Sweeny, Tweed, and Hall, have never been the same since he forced his cursed drugs down their throats. They were then, as so many of ourselves are to be, 'leaders and guides of their fellow-men;' but what are they now?" "Ay, and the fellow was brought up for his malpractice on them, and only that the law is so badly administered in New York, where would he have been to-day for his savage treatment of those once powerful but now sadly broken-down, consumptive citizens?"

Need we say that it is only the real quacks who ever take notice of comments like these, while the febrile condition which gives rise to them continues to exist? The physician, properly so called, calmly awaits the issue. He gives his medicines full time to operate. Even then, if he makes any reply, it is in no anger; and if he has any emotion of sorrow, it is for those from whom he had expected better sense and more decency.

And this has been precisely our feeling during the storm brought on our devoted head by the few pages we devoted in our last number to the University of Pennsylvania. At least a score of articles—all cut from Philadelphia papers—have been enclosed to us, each bespattering us with more or less abuse. It seems that some papers, not content with assailing us once or twice, for our grievous turpitude in this matter, have done so several times, presenting to their readers, day after day, "more last words"—the last of all being evidently intended in each case to be the most severe on us. Happening to visit Philadelphia, in the midst of the storm, we enter one of the street cars. We hear a newsboy lustily crying out with other things, "Great attack on the National Quarterly." We purchase a copy and read, "The Savage Quarterly and our Venerable University," etc.; in another we read, "Dr. Sears no Latinist;" in another, "Our venerable University vindicated from the malicious attack of savage Sears;"* in another, "Our learned and able Provost proved to be the right man in the right place, in spite of foreign libellers," etc. A friend remarks, with a good-natured smile, while significantly running his eye over an "Ulster" which nearly enveloped our whole person from head to toe, completely fortifying us against even the lowest depth of the mercury: "It must be confessed you look somewhat like a savage with that coat, but like a *comfortable* savage." "But that, although Irish frieze, has been made in the Modern Athens. Simmons, of Oak Hall, is the artist who fashioned it." "At all events, I would suffer to be called a savage at every corner of the street, especially if travelling such weather as this, for so excellent a protection as your Ulster affords. I only wish our great University could so effectually protect her venerable hide; then we should not soon again have so melancholy an illustration of the fable of the 'Boys and the Frogs,' as we are just now witnessing."

---

* It is some consolation that even in our condition of savagery we shall have tolerably respectable company. When Ovid was in exile among the Scythians, he exclaimed, just as we might have exclaimed when addressing the University of Pennsylvannia in Latin: "I am a barbarian *here*, *because* I am not *understood* by any."

"Barbarus hic ego sum, quia non *intelligor ulli*."—*Trist.* v. 8, 8.

Byron, in his "Lament of Tasso," makes the author of *Gerusalemme Liberata* mourn over

"The mind's canker in its *savage mood.*"

and again, further on

"And I can banquet like a *beast of prey*,
Sullen and lonely, crouching in the cave
Which is my *lair*, and—it may be—my grave."

Pope was generally regarded as a tolerably clever writer and passable scholar until he wrote his "Dunciad;" but the subjects of that famous poem discovered then immediately, that, far from having either talent or learning, he was a stupid, ignorant fellow! Thus we read: "He hath undertaken to translate Homer from the Greek, *of which he knows not one word*, into English, *of which he understands as little.*" (Dennis, *Rem. on Homer*, p. 91.) "Mr. Pope is an open and mortal enemy to his country and to *the commonwealth of learning.*"(ib.)

Dryden, also, was admitted to possess some talent and intelligence until he commenced to expose the shams of the day. But all at once, then, he became a "savage." Accordingly, we read as follows: "In the poem called *Absalom and Achitophel*, are notoriously *traduced* the King, the Queen, the Lords, and Gentlemen, *not only their honorable persons exposed*, but the whole nation and its representatives, notoriously libelled. It is *scandalum magnatum*, yea, of Majesty itself." (*Whip and Key*, 4to, printed for R. Janeway, 1662, *Pref.*) As to his learning, we read thus: "Mr. Dryden was once, I have heard, at Westminster School. Dr. Busby would have whipped him for so childish a paraphrase. Nay, the meanest pedant in England would whip a lubber of twelve for construing so absurdly." (Milbourn on *Dryden's Virgil*, 8vo, 1691, p. 2, *et seq.*) "A camel will take upon him no more burden than is sufficient for his strength, but there is another *beast* that crouches under all." (*Whip and Key*, *Pref.*)

Our curiosity having been thus excited, we proceed to glance over the files of the leading journals. Seeing that we had never received a larger number of warm greetings in Philadelphia than on this occasion, we conclude that, after all, there must be some Philadelphia editors who had found extenuating circumstances in our case. At all events our researches through their files for the month of January reminded us very forcibly of the following incident: In a certain village some distance off, there lived a very pompous family. The heir, a youth of fifteen, and his mother, were particularly lofty and scornful in their ideas. A lady of the same village, who had more taste and discernment than wealth to boast of, said to her son, another lad of about the same age: "Henry, just give that Mark Antony Smith a box on the ear when you get a good opportunity." Henry, being a dutiful boy, did not wait long, but, instead of hitting Mark Antony on the ear and making that organ still longer than it was, he hit him on the nose, producing quite a respectable stream of blood. Mrs. Smith, brimful of indignation, and breathing nothing but vengeance, hastens to complain of Henry to his mother. "Why, can it be possible, you scoundrel," says Mrs. Jones, "that you would make such an attack on Mark Antony Smith, the son of the most respectable lady in the whole parish, not to mention her ancient family?" at the same time seizing a bulrush which looked like an osier, and applying it with great energy to the jacket of the culprit. "But, mother, didn't you tell me? You bid me give him a box on the ear, and that's all I was going to do; but when he tried to run away, his nose ran against my fist!"

The scene that followed may be more easily imagined than described; but it was not half so ridiculous as that presented by the learned Faculty of the University of Pennsylvania, reinforced by their *alumni*, throughout the month of January, and we know not how long afterwards. First, we were glad that we had put a good job in the way of our Philadelphia *confrères*, for just then business in other departments seemed rather slack. Indeed, we felt somewhat as St. Paul did when he said, "Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have I freely give," etc. The quotation may not be entirely accurate; but accuracy in quoting Scripture can hardly be expected from a "savage." Be this as it may, we soon learned that whatever benefits our friends obtained or were promised, they earned them but too well. Thus, to-day the citadel of the Press is besieged by professors and *alumni*, and, the commandant being unfortunately absent, a *coup de main* was "fully apprehended." To-morrow, the fortress of the North American is completely beleagured; but Gen. McMichael is too much of a veteran to allow his equanimity to be much disturbed by loud talk and swagger, and accordingly he takes no further notice of the affair than to tell his adjutant, while trying to suppress a smile, to read a part of the first chapter of Gulliver's Voyage to Lilliput. The adjutant read the following with as grave a face as he could, and gave no further attention to the besiegers:

> "I heard a confused noise about me," says Gulliver, "but in the posture I lay I could see nothing except the sky. In a little time I felt something alive moving on my left leg, which, advancing gently forward over my breast, came almost to my chin; when, bending my eyes downward, as much as I could, I perceived it to be a human creature not six inches high, with a bow and arrow in his hands and a quiver at his back. In the meantime, I felt at least forty more of the same kind and (as I conjectured) *following the first*. I was in the utmost astonishment, and roared so loud that they all ran back in a fright, and some of them, as I was afterwards told, were hurt with the falls they got by leaping from my sides upon the ground."

The next evening, trenches deep and wide are discovered before the redan of the Bulletin. The following day quite a large squad of sappers and miners are found busily at work before the redoubts of the Inquirer. Unhappily, in the two latter cases the commandants had gone from home, and delegated their authority to a pair of nervous old ladies who, although naturally kind and humane as well as civil, were, of course, easily frightened; and so the moment the doughty Provost-marshal made his appearance, mounted on his well-known sweet-voiced charger, they surrendered at discretion, and agreed to throw any amount of missiles, however nasty and unsavory, at the enemy. On the fifth or sixth day, what seem to be elaborate earthworks begin to appear before the outposts of another journal, but a veteran, generally acknowledged, even by his enemies, to be the greatest captain of The Age, examines those earthworks with his field-glass, and, finding that they are composed chiefly of mud and froth, he orders out a corporal's guard, with instructions only to laugh at the besiegers!

Indeed, to their honor be it mentioned, most of the editors held out as long as possible. Nay, there are some who, we believe, have never surrendered to this day. But, even in the cases of those who surrendered at discretion, there are strong extenuating circumstances which we beg leave to urge in their favor. As intimated above, in another form, reinforcements were constantly arriving until every office was completely invested, the combined squadrons being commanded by the redoubtable Provost Stillé, whose ultimatum was found, "when rightly apprehended," to be a thing of "startling significance." Even then all did not, as we have seen, surrender together; some held out a whole week after the rest. In each case there was a parley before the *articles* of war were drawn up. 'First editor: "What do you want us to do?" Provost: "Say, 'if it be true that we have here and now a true University,' Sears is a savage and an ignoramus for mocking at the said venerable University. Give his so-called National Quarterly fits, and see that 'the people of Philadelphia are fully impressed with the belief' that it is only a horribly stupid publication." Editor: "Surely you would not want us to stultify ourselves. For thirteen years we have been in the habit of recommending the careful perusal of articles in this Review, especially its expositions of *shams* and *frauds* all kinds; and in every instance we have learned subsequently that the articles so commended—and commended for their learning and research, as well as for their fearlessness and impartiality—were written by Sears himself. How then can we apply such terms as you propose to Review and editor for what we must admit, after all, *entre nous*, is but an illustration of the principle of free thought?"

The learned Provost, feeling that this is not the way to aid him in fitting his pupils to be "leaders and guides of their fellow-men," does not deign to reply, but withdraws abruptly and enters another office. Second editor: "Very happy to see you, Mr. Provost. I see you have been treated in a most rascally manner. But what do you think of your defenders? It seems to me that there is no prayer our venerable University ought to offer up more fervently just now than 'From our friends, good Lord, deliver us!'" Provost: "That's so; 'if rightly apprehended,' there has been a collusion. But can't *you* do the thing right? You know I was always your friend 'in this community,' and I'm ready to be your friend *here* and *now*." Editor: "But what am I to do? Those fellows you have gone to first have spoiled the whole affair." Provost: "You can defend my English, anyhow. You must have seen it often enough quoted in your columns, in advertisements in praise of Philadelphia books. This, however, won't do much good except you attack Sears. You can say he is an impudent, sacrilegious, savage fellow, and worse than that. Don't you know that we issue *degrees* to all deserving people, especially to friends of our beloved University, and, now that it is 'a true University,' our diploma will be more valuable, you know, than ever; your friend Prof. Bathus cau tell you that the demand for it has largely increased since we got into our splendid new buildings, and began to give instructions in 'all the departments of human knowledge.'" Editor: "Yes; but it is necessary to be careful. Everybody knows that our legislators at Harrisburg are very fond of *degrees*. Then, if the thing were much talked of, it might be said that the $100,000, so handsomely voted to our venerable University last fall, was the price of degrees; and this might suggest to malicious people a comparison with the Credit Mobilier, which was galvanized by the same legislators for the consideration of only $50,000, and their chances." Provost: "I hadn't thought of that;. but you know I have spoken in my celebrated window speech of 'the far-reaching results of *what has been done to us and to those who are to come after us.*'" Editor: "Yes; that was very fine indeed; but I fear it won't help us much in our present dilemma." Provost: "Well, but anyhow, you can attack Sears's Latin letter, for it seems it is his, after all. Prof. Onos advised me first to deny that I received it, and I did so for more than a week. Then Prof. Alazon advised me to say I had torn it up and thrown it into my waste-basket. This plan too I tried; but I saw it did not satisfy all. Even the students made insinuations which, when I rightly apprehended them, were very hurtful to my feelings."

Third editor: "My opinion is that the best thing you can do now, is to come out boldly and condemn the Latin letter in your official capacity, as awfully bad. This plan, you will readily see, has several recommendations. There is no need for you to point out any of its defects, but attack the whole thing in the lump, and of course we will fully endorse the worst you say of it. The great advantage of this plan is that for every one who can tell whether, you, or we, are right or wrong in our condemnation, there are at least five thousand to whom good or bad Latin is as great a mystery as the grace of God which passeth all understanding. Of course these five thousand would side with you; and though one should sneer and pretend Sears was right in mocking at our venerable University and at your English, the overwhelming majority would be in your favor; so that your fame as a learned and literary man would be greater than ever, if that were possible."

This had the desired effect, for after the battle had raged for twenty-seven days, all on one side—the enemy having remained quietly ensconced in his intrenchments—on the twenty-eighth day, a day memorable "in the history of the community in which we live," the redoubtable Provost enters the field again mounted on his favorite charger Onos of the sweet voice, and armed with a mutilated copy of that horrible Latin missive. The onset of Achilles, backed by his whole army of Myrmidons, was a mere tempest in a tea-pot compared to this.

Hereafter, accordingly, we must try to be serious—at least as much so as the nature of the case will admit. Most of the intelligent people of Philadelphia have found it difficult to understand what a Latin letter written off in New York by a "savage" has to do with the sort of *English* taught in the University of Pennsylvania. Assuming the Latin to be bad, does the bad Latin of a "savage," or even of a civilized man, make the bad English of a learned Provost, or venerable University, anything the less objectionable?

But let us see what this Latin affair is. First, it is denied that the epistle alluded to was written by us at all. We merely got somebody to write it for us. This being the case, why should the learned Provost answer it, though sufficiently prompt in answering English letters? It seems this did not satisfy many, so it had to be discarded. The next plan is to deny that the letter had been received at all. This in turn gives way to that of admitting that it was received, but immediately consigned to the learned Provost's waste-basket for the most inglorious use. For some days this seemed a happy idea. But, Quakers are not merely shrewd, honest people. Sometimes they are rather sarcastic; their sneers are rather cutting, even to the faculty of a venerable university. Nay, even the trustees begin to shrug their shoulders, and their lower lips are seen to yield very decidedly to the law of gravitation. The Provost scratches his head for the twentieth time; and all of a sudden it is discovered that the "dead language" performance was the work of no other than the "savage" himself! What is queerer still, if possible, it is discovered just at the same moment that the Latin is no Latin—only "so-called!" And this is demonstrated as clearly as any proposition in Euclid by the fact that "a graduate" has, after unwearied researches, detected two typographical errors in our article—one making Quintili*us*, Quintili*an*, the other making "visitab*am*," "visitab*at*." That is, in the first the letter *a* is substituted for *u*; in the second, the letter *t* is substituted for the letter *m*. No one competent to judge had any difficulty in understanding that it was Quintilius, the contemporary of both Virgil and Horace, who was meant—the same of whom Horace says in his *Ars Poetica*—

Quintilio si quid recitares, Corrige, sodes,
Hoc, aiebat, et hoc; melius te posse negares,
Bis terque expertum frustra; *delere jubebat*,
Et malè formatos incudi reddere versus.
Si *defendere delictum*, quàm *vertere*, malles:
Nullum ultrà verbum, aut operam insumebat inanem,
Quin sine rivali *teque et tua solus amares*.[*]—438 *et seq.*

He, of whom the poet speaks thus, was precisely what we designated him, the writer who of all those of the Augustan age, was most distinctively a critic, whereas Quintilian was not a critic at all, in the sense in which we used the term, but a rhetorician who flourished more than a century later. In the original quoted from Horace, the name was printed correctly, because it was taken directly from a book, whereas, in the two instances in which *a* is put in place of *u*, the compositor had only our scrawl.

But supposing the fact had been different—that we had made Virgil weep over Quintilian instead of Quintilius, what then? It is known in most high schools, as well as universities, if not in the University of Pennsylvania, that even in some of the finest works of art there are gross anachronisms. Thus, for example, Tintoret, in his admirable painting of the Israelites gathering manna in the desert, has armed the Hebrews with guns. We have not heard that anybody has called Albert Durer a "savage" because, in his painting of St. Peter denying Christ, he represents a Roman soldier as smoking a pipe of tobacco! But these, we may be told, were not writers.

---

[*] "If you recited anything to Quintilius he would say, Correct, I pray, this and this. Did you deny that you could do it better, having tried in vain twice or three times, he would tell you to blot out and again apply your crude verses to the anvil. If you chose rather to *defend than to admit a fault, he wasted not a word*, or fruitless effort more, but that you alone might admire both yourself and your productions without a rival."

This objection will hardly hold in the case of Schiller, who, in his noble historical drama "Piccolomini," speaks of "a lightning-conductor"—a thing not invented till one hundred and fifty years later. Doubtless it was because Shakespeare was not educated at some such learned institution as the University of Pennsylvania, but at such, perhaps, as Paddy Burns' school in the bogs, that in his "Coriolanus" he speaks of Alexander, Cato, and Galen as familiar to his hero, although even their great-grandmothers were yet unborn! But it is sometimes denied that "Coriolanus" is the work of Shakespeare. This, however, cannot be said of the fine tragedy of Julius Cæsar, in which Cassius speaks of a *clock* striking. Still less can it be said of "King Lear," in which we read that Gloster must not be compelled to the use of spectacles, things not invented for ages after his time!

So much, then, for our stupidity, ignorance, etc., in regard to Quintilius or Quintilian, or both, assuming that we must plead guilty to that lamentable anachronism. Now, a word as to the paragraph from our Latin letter. This we had to send back to the printer half a dozen times. Finally, seeing that there remained only the difference between *bam* and *bat*, we said to ourselves, "Well; let it go. It will be some time before Provost Stillé can tell the difference. In the meantime, perhaps, the thing is better as it is, for if "bam" were repeated within so small a compass, the learned Provost might take offence, supposing we meant so vulgar and heinous a thing as to *bam* him!

But before saying anything more of the Latin stumbling-block, we will quote a passage from the first editorial "vindication" of the University of Pennsylvania and its learned Provost, that we have seen. Thus, in the Press of January 17, we find an article which closes as follows:—

"Dr. Sears prints several letters from this city, calling upon him to give his attention to our University as he has to other similar institutions, and telling him that there is much about it which demands censure. Dr. Stillé, in declining to permit Dr. Sears to hear the recitations, *made, we think, a mistake,* though it is probable he could justify himself. It must be understood that but one side of the case has been heard. As to Dr. Stillé's knowledge of Latin and English, Dr. Sears proves nothing. The speech he gives as an example was *as much the work of a newspaper reporter as of the Provost of the University*, for it is clipped with acknowledgment from the *Ledger*, and it is not even pretended that it is given in Dr. Stillé's own words. Dr. Sears' Latin epistle *may never have been received.* It is *not claimed that it was by the writer, who only says he sent it.* But *if received*, that it was not answered does not evidence that it was not *read and understood.* There *can be no fair objection to a just criticism* of the University. Its best friends *long since became aware* that so long as it was located at Ninth and Chestnut streets in the very heart of a great city, *its powers were contracted.* It was possible to exercise very little control over the students, and the students themselves found it difficult to understand their true position at college, surrounded as they were on every side by the daily traffic, the life, and the amusements of Philadelphia. Doubtless the University *is not the institution it should be.* We *do not claim* that it has been, but we submit that the time for such adverse criticism as that of the REVIEW has been badly chosen. The University has just occupied its new buildings; has just secured the accommodations the lack of which it has suffered from for years. It has started upon a new course, and it should be allowed a trial before it is condemned. If, however, the REVIEW's *paper serves to spur* the energies of the faculty, *no Philadelphian will complain.* The *spur may* not be be needed, *but greater system and activity can do no harm.*"

Only a few days before the publication of this defence, the critic of the Press—a gentlemen who had long occupied a similar position on leading journals of London and New York—had given an elaborate review of the same National Quarterly, commending it, as usual, in the most complimentary language.* But even in the defence just quoted, what allegation of ours is disproved? All that is even *denied*, is that against the English and Latin of Provost Stillé. In order to vindicate the former, the blame of bad grammar is thrown on a "newspaper reporter;" but if the reporter thought it worth while to speak out on the subject, we have good reason to know that he could show that, instead of having injured Dr. Stillé's speech, he had considerably improved it. But the Press says, "it is not even pretended that it is given in Dr. Stillé's own words." This is a mistake, for it is directly and formally quoted in the Ledger exactly as we have given it. Indeed, the only error the honest reporter seems to have committed is that of affixing M. D. to the name of Provost Stillé, for several Philadelphians have written to us to say that that functionary knows still less about medicine than he does about Latin or Greek, and is no more entitled to M. D. than he is to F. R. A. S.

---

* A brief extract or two from this may not be uninteresting, as showing the light in which the Literary editor of the Press, who has nothing to do with politics, viewed the whole "savage" affair:—

* * * "Under the quaint but taking head of 'The University of Pennsylvania and its New Windows,' we find some *amusing banter* respecting one

The reader will also observe what the Press says about the Latin letter; for just then the plan was, as we have shown above, to maintain stoutly that it was a thing gotten up to order, since nobody who was such a "savage" as to call into question the learning of the University of Pennsylvania and its discreet Provost could be supposed for a moment capable of such a performance. However, it seems the Press article was not satisfactory, partly, we understand, because it declined to call us hard names, and partly because it could entertain for a moment the barbarous idea that the spur (only think of the cold steel) should be applied in any contingency to so venerable a hide!

So far as we are informed, the North American thought,

---

of our own local institutions. * * * * The reply was, that the Doctor could be present at the commencement exercises in June, when the public were admitted, which was *not* what was required. After the interval of a year the Provost was again addressed, and the prompt reply was, that 'he would be pleased to show us all the class-rooms, the lecture-halls, etc. In short, he would show us every courtesy, except to allow the recitations to be heard by one who might possibly make unfavorable criticisms upon them.' Then the pertinacious correspondent wrote a letter in Latin, which the Provost has not answered. * * * 'The Puffing Element in American Literature' is a deservedly severe criticism upon two volumes, Manuals of American and English Literature, intended to be text-books for Schools and Colleges, compiled by," etc. * * * "Numerous examples of bad grammar, bad taste, and incorrect statements are given, and the reviewer is especially and justly severe on the fact that, in numerous instances, Prof. Hart has permitted authors whose writings possess little interest, to *write notices of themselves*, in which truth is almost lost in exaggerated self-eulogy. Indeed, one author has been allowed to give a list of the people with whom he has dined in London as a proof of his high merit. *Such an article as this published now and then cannot fail to be useful as a wholesome corrective* to the class of mere book compilers."

as the friend both of the University and its Provost, that the less said about the whole affair the better; and we are not sure but its plan might have been the wisest had it been generally adopted. But the chief burden of the defence seems to have fallen on the Bulletin and the Inquirer. We admit the prowess of both champions; nor do we deny that in this case they have fought with a fierceness worthy of a better cause. Still, when it is borne in mind that they had to do with a "savage" who had made so diabolical an attack on the divinities of the place—the venerable and ever-to-be-honored *Dii Lares*—it may, perhaps, be admitted that after all they were not unduly sanguinary. Nay, some pretend that while the twain pretended to wax most indignant, they laughed in their sleeve at the nature of their case. We are informed that some of their former testimonies loomed up before them like avenging spectres—such testimonies, for instance, as the following from the Bulletin:

> "Some particularly *fearless* and *original opinions* heretofore expressed in the *National* have established an almost personal feeling of *respect* and *esteem* between its readers and itself. Of this kidney are the views expressed by the author of the paper in the present (December) number on 'Our Millionaries and their Influcnce.' The writer *puts into words what many of us have been feeling for a long time*," etc.*

---

* Nay, the literary critic of the Bulletin really spoke in no different spirit when reviewing the number containing the obnoxious article only a few days before the learned Provost and Faculty had commenced hostilities. Thus, the reader may judge for himself, whether, notwithstanding the use of the term "savage," there was not a little irony in regard to our "venerable institution" in the following:

> "The National Quarterly Review for December is chiefly noticeable for a savage attack upon 'The University of Pennsylvania and its new Windows,' in which the author—evidently Dr. Sears himself—condemns our venerable institution as *inferior to a well-conducted high-school*: basing his strictures partly upon hearsay evidence, *partly upon cursory examinations of a few of its graduates*, but, chiefly, as it would seem, upon the refusal of the Provost to admit the editor of the National Quarterly to his recitation rooms. The paper *makes serious charges*, but fails to *establish* them by *good* evidence. A *sarcastic* article on 'The Puffing Element in American Literature,' *apropos* of a recent series of text-books for schools, *is in better style and is well deserved.*"

One article is "savage," and the other merely "sarcastic," just because the former has to do with the big divinities of Philadelphia, whereas the latter has to do only with a small Jersey divinity!

Now, since it is the same person who wrote all the articles which pleased the critic of the Bulletin so much, that has also paid his respects to the University of Pennsylvania, it must, we think, be admitted that the condition of savagery has supervened rather abruptly and strangely. Even the Darwinian theory will scarcely account for so remarkable a phenomenon. It was all very well, it seems, to attack the frauds and shams of New York and other parts of the Republic; but it is quite another matter to meddle with the University of Pennsylvania and its new windows! This, it seems, is an affair of altogether a different "kidney"; and yet, of nothing we have ever penned could the Bulletin more truly say in its own energetic, expressive language, that "The writer puts into words *what many of us have been feeling for a long time.*" Nay, in fact it does say, even in the article headed "Savage Sears," what amounts to the same, thus: "*Everybody in Philadelphia knows that the Department of Arts and Sciences has been, for some years past, in a depressed condition.*" Yet, in the same paragraph, we are accused of a "spiteful attack" that was "most ungraciously ill-timed" (!). This is very much like the jury verdict: "We find the accused guilty of murder in the first degree; but we entirely acquit him because the savage prosecutor, being a malicious, spiteful fellow, brought him into court at the wrong time. We recommend, therefore, that the said savage prosecutor be put into the dock in his place, and sentenced at least to the pillory for a month or so, especially as it is notorious that he is an old offender." Happily there is this difference between our case and that in which the above verdict was rendered. The charge against the University of Pennsylvania and its worthy Provost, and of which the ablest and most zealous of their own counsel substantially admit their guilt, is not homicide—they stand arraigned only for murdering both ancient and modern languages, especially her Majesty's English.

So much for our savagery, as shown by the Bulletin. Then we had issued only one number since the Inquirer complimented us still more highly, if possible, than its evening contemporary, as follows:

"The National Quarterly Review, of which Dr. Edward I. Sears is editor and *chief contributor, is by far the best of all our American quarterlies*, and is at least equal to any of the English. Brilliant, learned, and strictly impartial, it has *from its very commencement waged ceaseless war against every species of bigotry and intolerance, fraud, corruption, and imposture.*" *

These are but specimens of the compliments we have been in the habit of receiving from the leading journals of Philadelphia for thirteen years past; and we have always valued them the more highly, partly from their being entirely spontaneous, and partly from the evident marks of culture and ability which they bear. To this day we do not know who either the critic of the Bulletin or the critic of the Inquirer is; but we do know that neither has ever been under the slightest compliment to us; and still more emphatically, if possible, may we say so of the publishers of these journals. In short, both papers have ever been as disinterested and generous in their encouraging words to us up to the day we chose for our subject the University of Pennsylvania and its New Windows, as the Press, the North American, and the Age; or as the New York Herald, New York Times, Boston Post, Boston Transcript, etc., etc.

It will be admitted, therefore, that we could afford to wait three months to vindicate ourselves from the charge of savagery, as well as from that of having been actuated in the window case by the most diabolical motives. Besides we had long since become well used to be called hard names; we had been honored with such by the quack doctors, the quack insurers, the quack patriots, the quack ring-leaders, etc., etc. Had it been otherwise, we might have excused ourselves on the ground that did we undertake to defend ourselves from those who accuse us of having done grievous injustice, through spite, or "malice prepense," to themselves or their ancestors, we might do nothing else from the day we issue one number until it is time to issue another. Thus, for example, our Philadelphia readers at least can tell that we should have been kept pretty busy for six weeks of the time, had we attempted to answer the avalanche of fierce articles hurled at us in that hitherto courteous and hospitable city. In various other quarters we stood arraigned for, that we, "in a certain rhapsody, styled 'The Puffing Element in American Literature,' did maliciously, etc., without the fear of God before our eyes, make an unprovoked, atrocious and felonious assault on sundry great authors and authoresses, including several members of the renowned Smith family." Elsewhere, the rabble in the back streets have assailed us with those foul, unsavory weapons congenial to that interesting class, for having libelled certain illustrious divines, living and dead, the former of whom has since been promoted for his piety, learning and meekness! Let our Philadelphia friends please remember that the worst language used by the Bulletin and Inquirer, in defence of the University of Pennsylvania and its learned Provost, was mild and gentlemanly compared to that of the vindicators of the saintly and infallible Alexander VI., and the almost equally saintly and infallible Father Corrigan, now by the grace of God, and the recommendation of his learned and pious Grace of New York, promoted to be the Right Reverend Bishop Corrigan. For just the same as we are declared guilty of having attacked the whole good people of the Keystone State, especially all patriotic Philadelphians, in venturing to make some observations on the University of Pennsylvania, so are we declared guilty of having attacked the whole Catholic Church, because we could neither take part in the rehabilitation of St. Borgia, nor in the white-washing of St. Corrigan, so as to make him a fit and proper companion of that other great Seton Hall luminary, St. McQuade.

---

* When the conservative and dignified Philadelphia North American has expressed any opinion of our journal it has spoken as follows:—

"This periodical approaches nearer, in design and execution, to the great English standards, the Edinburgh, the Westminster, the London Quarterly, Blackwood's, the Dublin University, etc., than any other American magazine or review."

Or, thus:—

"The National is an interesting and valuable review, and one that does honor to the spirit and scholarship of the country."

Even in its review of our last number—that containing the obnoxious "window" article—it pays us the compliment of saying that, in our preface to the article on Pope Alexander VI., we give "expression to the enlightened sense of Christendom, Catholic as well as Protestant."

It will hardly seem strange, then, that the only instance in which we have ever written to any paper in defence of ourselves, or our journal, in regard to any criticism we have made, is that in which Mayor Hall issued his celebrated proclamation against us in the New York Herald, headed "The Cat out of the Bag." His Honor, seeing no other way of hurting us, or weakening the force of our criticism, manipulates a private letter and embodies it in his manifesto to show that we were actuated by spite and malice in attacking such high-minded, incorruptible and patriotic statesmen as his worthy colleagues. All the Ring papers were directed to copy this proclamation from the Herald, and in all city and suburban papers not belonging to the Ring it was published as an advertisement. In each of the former it was accompanied with more or less editorial abuse—all for our being such vile slanderers as to pretend that New York was not in a happy condition under "Ring-leader rule." As the Ring was just in its glory at this time, the majority of our good credulous people regarding it as quite the right sort of government, we thought it proper to reply to his Honor. In this letter we admitted that he was entirely right in proclaiming "the cat out of the bag," but added that he and those high-minded people whom he defended so well, would find ere long that it was the wrong cat! This brought on us fresh storms of abuse, which continued for weeks, and this failing to frighten us, or prevent us from advertising our "malicious libel on honesty and integrity," now issued separately, in pamphlet form, and extended to the third edition, another member of the feline tribe was let loose against us disguised in a petticoat. To be attacked in this fashion is, to use the language of Provost Stillé, "an event of great significance in the community in which we live." But fortunately, in this case, the event was "rightly apprehended;" so the only mischief it did us was to afford our editorial friends a fresh excuse for hurling mud and garbage at us. Not that they had any mortal spite against us, or indeed any real wish to annihilate us; but that they were shrewd enough to understand the force, "in the community in which we live," of the adage, "no pater noster, no pay!"

Now, is it not a singular fact, that, except in one or two particulars, the course of Provost Stillé toward us has been exactly like that of Mayor Hall? One chieftain as well as the other has sought to shield himself and his accomplices from criticism, which it is notorious was eminently deserved, by publishing a private letter, courteously written to him under the supposition that he was a gentleman. No canon of social ethics is more universally recognized in any enlightened community than that he is no gentleman, let his position be what it may, who would be guilty of such meanness. But in justice to Mayor Hall, it should be said that he had the manliness and decency to apologize to us fully for his violation of the amenities of life; and he is entitled to the more credit for this because he made the apology while the Ring, to which he belonged, and in whose defence he had assailed us, was still intact—none of the forged vouchers, or other tangible evidences of guilt, having yet been found against its members. Another difference between the two chiefs is that Mayor Hall took the part of himself and his friends in pretty good English; and that when he rose to deliver a speech, if he made his audience laugh it was not by his bad English, but by his ready wit. Because, on reflection—on consulting his better nature—Mayor Hall acted thus gracefully, we have never reproduced in this journal, or in any other, the letter to the Herald in which we denounced him, with, perhaps, undue severity, for having forgotten that he was a gentleman.

But let us observe the contrast in the points indicated. Provost Stillé let out his "cat" in a very awkward way. Not but he kept the animal long enough in durance—more than two years! Finally, after the great battle has been raging for a whole month, the Provost, acting on the advice of one of his gunpowder friends, as shown above, enters the field with his cat, and after receiving a little brushing up in his syntax and orthography is led into action by the Inquirer, as follows:

THE "QUARTERLY REVIEW" AND THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Dr. Stillé, Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, has sent us the following letter explanatory of another letter which has achieved some recent notoriety:

"UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, January 27, 1873.

"ED. PHILADELPHIA *Inquirer*—As there seems to be a good deal of curiosity to know why the Provost of the University took no notice of a so-called Latin letter written to him by Dr. Sears, that portion of the letter which the doctor did *not* print in his article is here given:

"'Nunc te audire bene oro. Quoniam renunciationem doctæ et inclytæ universitatis tuæ in nonnullis ephemeradibus vidi permissionem dicere peto, ut placeret multum mihi si esses tam bonus quam meum ascribere intereas quas in isto modo honoras et faves. Spero ut nulla bona ratio sit cur eam posses ponere in N. Q. R. Complures collegorum ac universitatium in patria nostra regulariter nuntiet in trimestre modesto meo. Gratissimum mihi faceris si vis in hoc negotio me favere.

"'EDVARDUS I. SEARS.'

"Your readers must decide whether a Latin letter from the Provost would not have been wholly incomprehensible to one who is evidently ignorant of the rudiments of that language, and also whether Dr. Sears' 'zeal' for the advancement of classical learning in the University was not somewhat quickened by the Provost's strange obtuseness and ignorance in failing to understand what was meant by 'renunciationem nuntiet.' C. J. S."

Of all the suicidal acts committed by Provost Stillé, in his official capacity, this is undoubtedly the most fatal. First, our modest epistle is sadly mutilated; prepositions and nouns are jumbled together as if they too had got into a row with each other. Yet, even in this "laid out" state there is no such expression, in any part of our letter as "renunciationem nuntiet;" that which the learned Provost quotes as settling the point in regard to our ignorance. But the merest smatterer in Latin can see presently on what side the ignorance really is.

First, however, we will mention a little incident. A few years ago we attended the "commencement" exhibition of St.

Xavier's College, in this city. The audience being composed chiefly of Irish servant-maids and their beaux, when any allusion was made to "ould Ireland" by the orators of the occasion the cheering and stamping were worse than deafening. In making some jocose comments on this state of things, it occurred to us that it might be well for us to fortify ourselves with a little Latin. Aware, from experience, that let us write what we would—no matter how—in that tongue, our New York Jesuit Fathers would show their own superior learning by abusing it, in order to show some friends who took an interest in such matters how spurious this learning was, and at the same time to afford them a hearty laugh, we transcribed a few sentences from that part of the seventh book of Cæsar's Commentaries in which he describes the manners and customs of the Gauls, commencing with the following: "*Conclamat omnis multitudo, et suo more armis concrepat,*" etc. Just ten days after our number containing this is issued, a certain New York Catholic paper is sent us, in which our uttér ignorance of Latin is demonstrated as beyond question! It was so gross that no abuse was considered too severe for us, or in fact severe enough. "A fellow," says our critic, "that knows no more about Latin than to write "multitudo concrepat," only makes himself ridiculous and contemptible when he pretends to give any opinion whatever of our great Jesuit colleges." The construction, "suo more armis," was condemned with equal indignation and severity. In this case the epithet "savage" was entirely too mild for us; and so we were decorated with half a dozen infinitely worse. But to this day our only reply has been a hearty laugh at the contemptuous abuse we had brought on the Latin of Julius Cæsar! *

We had by no means forgotten this when writing to the learned Provost of the University of Pennsylvania. Accordingly, in order to be prepared for the worst, we had our Latin epistle carefully copied with a copying-press, thus securing a perfect fac-simile of it. From this the paragraph we gave in our last number was taken, and in which *t* was printed for

---

* *De Bello Gal.* L. VII. c. XXI.

m—the third person for the first. We now present our readers the whole letter exactly as it was penned:

"Kal. xii, Nov. 1871.

"AD DR. CAROLUM J. STILLÉ, *Præfectum*, *etc.*:

"CARE DOMINE.—Quando eram in urbe amœna tua, nuper, visitabam tuum auditorium. Volebam per multum te videre, sed infeliciter foris eras. Verum est, certè, quod Prof. Johannes McElroy valdè comis et jucundus erat. Equidem, si placet tibi, vellem multas gratias illi, per te, agere pro urbanitati suæ.

"Nunc te audire benè oro. Quoniam renunciationem doctæ et inclytæ universitatis tuæ in nonnullis ephemeridibus vidi, permissionem dicere peto, ut placeret multum mihi si esses tam bonus quam meum ascribere inter eas quas in isto modo honoras et faves. Spero ut nulla bona ratio sit cur eam non posses ponere in N. Q. R.

"Complures collegorum ac universitatium in patriâ nostrâ regulariter nuntiat in trimestre modesto meo. Gratissimum mihi faceris si vis in hoc negotio me favere.

"Vale, care Domine.

"EDVARDUS I. SEARS."

The paragraphs, the sentences, the capital letters, even the punctuation, are all the same. We certainly do not mention this by way of boasting of our letter. Had we been writing an English letter to any respectable newspaper, for publication, we would have taken more pains with it than we did with that Latin communication to Provost Stillé. But, hurriedly written as the letter was, we can prove to the satisfaction of any impartial, competent judge, that our Latin is much more grammatical, and much more lucid than Provost Stillé's English. And if we do so, we think it will be admitted that there was some method in our savagery, even when we tried the effect of Latin on the learned stomach of that gentleman. Every experienced physician is aware that even the vulgar salts and senna have sometimes worked miracles, after all the milder and less nauseous medicines have been exhibited in vain; and so it has been in the case of our last venerable patient!

Thus, take our first paragraph. No one acquainted with the principles of the Latin language need be informed that all the other verbs in the passage testify that the use of *t* instead of *m*, was but a mistake. It was one moreover which occurs in the best editions of Cicero—nay, it was one which Cicero himself might have made with his stylus, the same as Macaulay might in the hurry of composition write *has* for *have*. In that passage there are three other verbs in the first person singular, viz.: *eram*, *volebam*, *vellem*. Why does not any of these end with a *t*? Why does not any of those that are, and should be, in the third person end with an *m*? Why is each verb in the indicative mood, the subjunctive, or the infinitive, in accordance with the principles of the Latin language?

Now let us pass to the part of the letter published with such an overwhelming flourish by Provost Stillé. It will be seen that the preposition *inter* and the pronoun *eas* are made one word by our learned Provost! It will be seen also that he makes nunt*iat* "nunt*iet*"—*nuntio* being of the first conjugation, and, therefore, forming its third person singular, present (historical) tense, just as we have used it. And this "nuntiet" he makes govern *renunciationem*, which occurs only in a former sentence, nay, in another paragraph, where it is the accusative of *vidi!* *

---

* We will now give Provost Stillé an opportunity of demonstrating what a fine Latin letter he would have written us by return of mail only that in the plenitude of his benevolence he was loath to puzzle us, and put our ignorance to the blush! Such thoughtful tender-heartedness deserves our warmest gratitude. Accordingly we beg leave to make the following proposition: Let a tribunal be formed consisting of four provosts or presidents of colleges, or universities, and two editors; two of the former and one of the latter to be chosen by him, we to be allowed the same privilege in choosing the remainder. Let this tribunal meet at the Continental Hotel, on a certain day to be previously agreed upon, and place the learned Provost at one table at one end of the room, and the savage editor at another table at the opposite end of the room. Let it be expressly provided that "such a *practice*" as "the *occasional presence* of strangers," "when the object *was* to *gain* a knowledge of the details of our system," be *not* set aside, but remain in full force.

After all the necessary preliminaries have been arranged, let a letter be dictated in the vernacular tongue—"a mere begging letter," or a threatening letter, as may be deemed most suitable for so memorable an occasion—to be rendered, off-hand, into Latin without any swagger, bolstering up, trick, The learned Stillé's style of criticism will remind many of our readers of a remarkably similar criticism made in Germany half a century ago, by another learned provost, president, director or superintendent; for we do not remember, at this moment, what was the exact title, at that time, of the functionary alluded to, and if we do not give the exact one in some way, we may be told "there was no *such person.*" It is well known that the University of Göttingen was once at the head of all the great literary and scientific schools of Germany. But owing to the demoralization consequent on the French invasion, the old habit of requiring both provost and professors to possess literary or scientific qualifications as a *sine qua non* was discarded, and in its stead was adopted the new habit of making skill and smartness in politics the chief qualifications. If anybody could show that he had written a pamphlet in praise of Napoleon and his peculiar mode of rendering Germany "free, independent. and happy," he had only to apply for a professorship at Gottingen. If he could only show that he had written two or three pamphlets, then, if he

---

or collusion; the party who breaks down in the effort to pay two hundred dollars in the current coin of the Republic, to be presented as a donation to the American Sunday School Union; and, also, to pay the full bill for a comfortable dinner, for the provosts, presidents, editors, reporters, bottle-holders, etc.

It would be acknowledged by the party of the second part, *alias* the savage editor, that the party of the first part, *alias* the learned Provost, might claim the following rights and privileges, *ex officio*, to wit: since it is generally difficult, if not impossible, to see what is not to be seen, as in the memorable instance "*renunciationem nuntiet,*" that high functionary may arm himself with *Queen's Educational Microscope* and *Ramshorn's Latin Synonymes*, both of which can be had in Chestnut street, not very far from the arena.

Finally, if by reason of his superior eloquence, as demonstrated so overwhelmingly in his famous window speech, he should prefer the oral mode of placing his classical learning beyond dispute, he shall have the right to address the savage editor in Latin, and if his Latin should prove more "incomprehensible" to the said savage than his English, let him be declared the victor! In either case the results are to be published in extras of the Inquirer and Bulletin. The successful "composition" to be headed in large capitals, with the legend, "Great is the University of Pennsylvania, and still greater is its learned Provost;" the unsuccessful composition to be headed with the more sober legend, "In the presence of men who are not blind or silly, *thou shalt not try to make an empty sack stand.*" (!)

had the ambition to be at the head of the institution, he had but to say the word, especially if he could make affidavit that he had some Gallic blood in his veins, though it were only the blood of a Gallic cobbler, or Gallic *blanchisseuse.* As to the German style in which the pamphlets were written, or whether the syntax or the orthography or both were defective, these were things with which Napoleon had nothing to do. It is hardly necessary to add that the results of the new system soon began to manifest themselves, so that in a short time the provost and faculty of the once noble and famous University of Gottingen became nearly as much objects of scorn and derision as those of the University of Pennsylvania are at this moment. Both the statesmen and scholars of England deeply regretted this, because the University of Gottingen had been founded and liberally endowed by George II. (of England). In order to test the truth of certain ugly rumors, George Canning once paid a visit to Gottingen *incognito.* He was refused admittance to the sacred precincts, but on his intimating that he merely came to purchase some degrees for himself and a few friends, he was hospitably entertained, and had no difficulty in striking a bargain for the pieces of parchment.

At this time Canning was one of the chief contributors to the famous *Anti-Jacobin,* edited by William Gifford, subsequently editor of the Edinburgh Review. Canning's first care on his return from Gottingen was to write *The Rovers,* a capital burlesque on the sentimental German drama. In this amusing piece he introduces Rogero, who sings a very mournful ditty, the two closing stanzas of which are:

"There first for thee my passion grew,
Sweet, sweet Matilda Pottingen!
Thou wast the daughter of my Tu-
tor, Law Professor at the U-
niversity of Gottingen,
niversity of Gottingen.

"Sun, moon, and thou vain world, adieu,
That kings and priests are plotting in,
Here, doomed to starve on water gru-
el, never shall I see the U-
niversity of Gottingen,
niversity of Gottingen.

Somebody was mischievous enough to send a copy of the Anti-Jacobin containing this lyric to the university of Gottingen, addressed to the *Vorsteher* of the Faculty. If Canning was not "exposed" for his ignorance and turpitude in this matter, nobody was ever exposed in the full sense of the term. One learned professor denounced him as an "impostor travelling under a false name," another as a "miserable spy," another as "an unprincipled fellow," etc. But his most formidable antagonist was the German professor of English, whose knowledge of that language was nearly as profound as Provost Stillé's knowledge of Latin! "A pretty fellow, indeed," says this gentleman, "to criticise one university; one that doesn't know the first arrangements of his own language. The biggest dummy in English *versteht* that only the ignorantest cockneys give one syllable at the end of a line in poesy and then begin a new line with the rest. *Mein Got! was für ein Critiker—ein Esel!*"

Of course Canning could never show his face after this. But those who made themselves most ridiculous in criticising and abusing Canning did not in their floundering engulf themselves in so low a depth of "outer darkness" as to make a verb in one sentence and paragraph govern a noun in another sentence and paragraph after the fashion of the learned Stillé's "*renunciationem nuntiet.*"

But, hurriedly as our Latin epistle was penned, we used a construction or two in it which we suspected were not very well known at the University of Pennsylvania. Thus we make the partitive *complures* the subject of a singular verb: we also make it the feminine gender, although one of the nouns to which it refers is neuter. But we need not go beyond American scholars to show that for one form as well as the other we have the best classical authority. Let those who doubt this take up Andrews' and Stoddard's Latin Grammar, turn to Section 209, and see for themselves. There it will be found stated under Remark 12, that "a verb in the singular is often used after several nominatives singular, *especially if they denote things without life.*" This is illustrated by two quotations from Cicero. "So also," we read, Note 9, "the compound subject *Senatus populusque Romanus* (the Senate and Roman people) has always a predicate in the singular." In the same section Livy is quoted to show that plural and singular nouns may be combined, and yet have their verb in the singular. Then we have in Terence such expressions as "*Amantium iræ amoris integratio est;*" in Sallust, such as "*Loca* quæ proxima Carthageniem Numidia *appellatur.*"

Then as to the gender we have the following: "When substantives denoting living beings are of different genders, the adjective is masculine rather than feminine, *and feminine rather than neuter.*" Again: "When there is a *mixture of animate and inanimate* objects, the adjective either *assumes the gender of the animate* object, or is put in the neuter." This is particularly true of partitives; for we read in the same American authority: "An adjective or adjective-pronoun *used partitively* (that is, like our *complures*) stands alone, and *commonly* takes the gender of the genitive plural which depends upon it, but when it is preceded by a noun of a different gender, to which it refers, it *usually* takes that gender, but *sometimes* that of the genitive, as: 'Elephanto belluarum *nulla* est prudentior,' etc."

In a word, we did not use a single construction in that scrawl which may not be found in the Latin classics of the Golden Age; nay, we can assert without fear of contradiction that *trimestris*, which we used as the equivalent of *Quarterly*, is the only word which is not used in a similar sense by Livy, Cicero, or Sallust; yet it took the learned Provost of the University of Pennsylvania more than two years, from the kalends of November, 1871, to the kalends of January, 1873, to answer it; and even then what a sad mess he makes of it! But he tells us he had excellent reason for the delay—he knew his Latin would be incomprehensible to us. Doubtless we should have mistaken it for Sanscrit or Parsi. Still it could hardly have puzzled us more than his English. But since it has taken the Provost of a University more than two years to answer our Latin letter, one would think that it would take the President of a similar institution three or four years to do so. It will hardly be believed, then, that there are American presidents who have answered our Latin letters just as promptly as they have our English letters. But in order to prove the fact we need only mention two names—Dr. Elliot of Harvard College, and Dr. White of Cornell University. Doubtless it will seem "incomprehensible" to Provost Stillé that each of these gentlemen replied not only promptly, but courteously and kindly. True, we wrote to each in Latin only because we knew they would have no trouble in replying, and would be rather pleased than otherwise at our doing so; whereas when we wrote to the Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, we confess we had grave doubts whether it was in the power of that learned functionary to reply at all. Now the world can judge with tolerable accuracy how far we were right or wrong in each case.

But another word before we proceed to compare Provost Stillé's English epistles with our Latin epistle. The reader has seen how handsomely the Inquirer has introduced the learned Provost armed with our mutilated two-year-old missive. While disclaiming all intention of "calling names," we beg leave to quote in favor of that respectable journal the ancient, though homely adage, "Help the lame dog over the stile." How well it carries out that humane precept will be sufficiently seen from the first paragraph of its commentary following its copy of our "so-called Latin letter." This we quote, only premising that the editor certainly smiled and scratched his head more than once before he printed it:—

> "It is unfortunate for Dr. Sears, that when he concluded to print his letter to Dr. Stillé, in the Quarterly, he did not print it all, because, though it would have disclosed, *to his great disadvantage*, his *singular motive* for attacking Dr Stillé under the too transparent cloak of *reforming our venerable University*, it would have prevented another from giving it a wider publicity, and thereby *demonstrating* the *dishonesty* of the Quarterly's editor." *

---

* **It is a curious fact that about the time we wrote our first letter to the**

"That's very good," says the learned Provost, "but 'tisn't half enough." Then the editor proceeds to denounce our missive as "a mere begging letter," "miserable school-boy Latin," etc. Still the erudite and brave Provost-martial is not satisfied. The Inquirer man again scratches his head, and tries to look grave. While hesitating, he remembers the case of the individual who, on being asked why so large and strong a man as he would allow so small and feeble a woman as his wife to beat him, replied, "Well, it plases Biddy, an' it does me no harm." Fortified in its conscience by this philosophical precept, the Inquirer winds up in the following overwhelming style:—

> "The part of the letter above, which Dr. Sears *suppressed*, is the most satisfactory reply possible to the Quarterly's attack on the university. *From it the fact is made apparent* that the attack was made *solely* because Dr. Stillé did not advertise in and subscribe for the Review."

University of Pennsylvania, addressing it so ignorantly "To the President," etc., the Philadelphia Age used the following language:

> **"The 'National Quarterly,' which Dr. Sears directs and manages, is a very Columbiad. It may not always hit the mark, but when it does, the splinters fly in all directions, and the battlements erected by error are crumbling into ruin."**

Has the truth of this been illustrated of late, or has it not? Has the *mark* been *hit* at West Philadelphia? How many of the *splinters* fell in the swamp? How many did it take to make the learned Provost run frantically to the newspaper offices, and implore the editors *ad misericordiam?* What part of his learned carcase was struck when he vomited up "the so-called Latin letter" in a mutilated but still undigested state?

Whether these questions can be satisfactorilly answered or not, it must be admitted that the bowels of compassion of The Age were as profoundly moved by the piteous whines of Stillé as if it had never said anything about Columbiads or the splinters which they make fly so unceremoniously, for it informs its readers, with as grave a face as possible, that if the learned Provost "does *refrain* from corresponding in Latin," etc., he has certain other qualifications "more valuable *in the post he fills* than the *special qualification for any chair in the institution.*" What then becomes of the learned Provost's *two* "chairs," those of "History" and "English Literature?" Are these only mythical chairs? If so, what do those "more valuable" qualifications of the Provost consist in? Have they anything to do with "lobbying" at Harrisburg for hundreds of thousands of dollars, at the expense of the good people of Pennsylvania? Or does The Age merely allude to the learned Provost's talents as a salesman in the *degree* business?

Now, the truth is that we have never asked anybody to subscribe; we have, however, taken the liberty to advise persons whom we regarded as gentlemen engaged in respectable, honest business, to place their prospectuses in our advertising pages, believing that, in exhibiting their goods to our readers, they would serve themselves quite as much as they would us. And what is more, the best educators in America, including Catholics, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists, as well as Episcopalians, have done us the honor of accepting our advice in that particular. Nor have we abandoned all idea of taking a similar liberty in future with educators whose pretensions we believe to be honest, or with those who are not educators merely in name or *ex officio*, but in reality. Moreover, we are satisfied in advance that none of this class will abuse our letter or ourselves. And were it otherwise, we should find consolation in the fact that some of the greatest thinkers and most learned men have not been ashamed to admit that they have written "begging letters." Dr. Johnson, for example, was not ashamed to write thus to Lord Chesterfield: "Seven years, my lord, have now passed since I waited in your outward rooms, or was repulsed from your door; during which time I have been pushing on my work, through difficulties of which it is useless to complain," etc. True, there is an immense difference between Chesterfield and Stillé, quite as much as there is between our humble selves and the great lexicographer. But we have never waited for one moment on Provost Stillé. We have once called to see some of the classes; of course, in doing so, we inquired for the head of the University. But he was not in, and we have never called the second time; nor have we ever to this moment seen Provost Stillé, so far as we are aware.

But why have not some of those who have so much abused the "so-called Latin letter," and its "savage" writer, attempted to translate it into the vernacular tongue, so that the good people of Philadelphia, at large, might be able to see for themselves what a serious thing it was that produced such a terrible commotion in those learned halls? Well, as nobody else seems to have done so we will essay that feat ourselves; the plain English of the matter is the following:

Nov. 20, 1871.

To Dr. Charles J. Stillé, *Provost, etc.:*

Dear Sir: While in your pleasant city, recently, I visited your institution (*auditorium*). I wished very much to see you, but unfortunately you were out (*foris*). It is true, certainly, that Prof. John McElroy was very courteous and complaisant. Indeed, were it agreeable to you I should like to present to him, through you, many thanks for his politeness.

Now, I pray you, listen. As I have seen the prospectus of your learned and renowned University in some journals, I ask permission to to say that it would please me much if you were so kind as to include mine among those which you honor and favor in this manner. I hope there is no good reason why you may not place your prospectus (*eam*) in the N. Q. R.

Several colleges and universities in our country make their announcements regularly in my modest Quarterly. It will be a very acceptable thing to me if you feel disposed to favor me in this matter.

Be of good cheer (or be strong), dear Sir.

Edward I. Sears.

Now, will the reader please give us his attention for a moment. We had already seen sufficient of the English composition of the learned Provost. One day we happen to take up a periodical sent to our office, entitled "The Penn Monthly," and find its ample outside cover page decorated from top to bottom with the prospectus of the University of Pennsylvania, including the "Faculty of the Department of Science," the "Faculty of the Department of Arts," etc. In this the great central figure is the learned Provost, who, with his name in large capitals, occupies about as much space as half a dozen of the other professors. First, the prospectus is duly signed by that high functionary as "Provost." This, of course, is all right. But, without anything intervening save a black line, his name is repeated in full, and put in flaming capitals with the following legend: "Provost of the University, *Professor of History and English Literature*." Here follows another black line, so that one is reminded of a large vacant city lot, in the centre of which stands a giant who is gazed at over the fence by the crowd of ordinary mortals. We read the prospectus and find it a capital thing—highly characteristic. We hunt up several back numbers of the Penn Monthly, and in each we find the grand and mighty Saturn, with his satellites and rings at respectful distance. We turn to the prospectus and read: "The *next* term in the Department of Arts and the Department of Science will begin on Monday," etc. After the great event had taken place, the prospectus was altered so that it read as follows: "The *first* term in the Department of Arts and the Department of Science began on Monday," etc. Does "next" imply that something of the same kind had gone before it, or not? If it does, what is the sense of "first" in this case? In every issue of the prospectus, before and after it was altered, we read, "The design is after giving a young man a thorough training in preliminary studies, to afford him special and practical instruction," etc. We give one more specimen of the English of the prospectus: "Every effort has been made in the arrangement of the building and its *equipment*, and in the selection of professors," etc. Is "equipment" a proper term in this sense? Let any one who thinks so turn to Webster or Worcester. The former concludes his definition of the verb *to equip*, thus: "To provide *with arms* or an *armament*, stores, *munitions*, *rigging*, *and the like;* said especially of *ships*, or of *troops*." Then the same lexicographer defines *equipment* as the act of equipping, or state of being equipped *as for a voyage or expedition;*" concluding his definition thus: "*warlike apparatus; necessaries* for an *expedition* or *for a voyage:* equipage; as the *equipments* of a *ship* or an *army*."

This will, perhaps, account for the hostilities so readily and fiercely commenced against us, and which have been so bravely and resolutely carried on.* The wonder to ourselves is how we have escaped thus far, seeing that scarcely were the holidays allowed to pass when broadsides were discharged at our devoted head almost daily for several weeks by so large and admirably "equipped" a squadron, while we had no other armament or "equipment" than one iron-clad armed with rifled cannon, and even that required three months' repairs before again unfurling the National flag.

---

*Why do not the learned Provost and Faculty of the University of Pennsylvania bring their "equipment" to bear on the daily and weekly papers throughout the United States, since their verdict everywhere, in regard to our "window article" has been "capital,—richly deserved," etc. But the

But now we have to record an event which almost makes us regret having ever said a word about " The University of Pennsylvania and its new windows," for scarcely had our "savage" article appeared when the University prospectus was withdrawn from the Penn Monthly! Thus, it was spread out at full length in the December number, as well as in many other consecutive back numbers, but in the next number that reaches us we find that it has disappeared like an exhalation. We proceed to reproach ourselves for having inflicted, however unintentionally, such an injury on the Penn Monthly, but are consoled in finding in place of the missing prospectus that of the Monthly, with the name of the learned Provost inserted as " among its contributors !"

---

general sentiment among the most intelligent has been that the great " Text-book for Schools and Colleges," and the University of Pennsylvania, should have been combined in one article, as nearly on a par with each other. Most of them admit, however, that the separate treatment has its advantages. Even the religious papers are ill-natured enough to laugh, and point the finger of scorn at the two great fountains of knowledge. In illustration of this we need only extract a brief passage or two from the Cincinnati *Christian Standard*, one of the ablest conducted weekly papers in this country. The following *morceau* will, we think, be quite sufficient :

> " And first we fall on 'The Puffing Element in Literature,' wherein the two 'Manuals' of English and American Literature, from the pen of Prof. John Hart, both noticed within a year in these columns, are subjected to *a pitiless overhauling*. That author's industry is *certainly far more abundant than his discretion*. * * * *Sham colleges* are likewise a pet field for *exposure* for our editor, who touches up the University of Pennsylvania in *another scathing article*. * * * The remaining articles of this number we find rather flat, or heavy ; *but those we have mentioned are not only readable, but* ENJOYABLE."

Now, who the editor or critic of the Christian Standard is, we do not know from Adam. All we know about him is, that he is evidently a man of superior culture, and, like the philosopher of Samosato, and our humble selves, " the declared enemy of all false pretences, all quackery, all lies, and all false puffing," etc. Then, why not at least call him a " savage ?"

Whether this insertion brings the Monthly as much, in hard cash, or " in trade" (diplomas), as the insertion of the University prospectus, or whether it costs that famous institution so much or not, we think it will be admitted, by all experienced and skilful physicians, that in writing, even in "miserable schoolboy Latin," to advise the insertion of that curious prospectus in our journal, we were still but carrying out, in our own humble way, the antiphlogistic treatment of our venerable patient.

But, as the blame of the bad English of the Provost's famous window speech was thrown upon the reporter, so the blame of the University "equipment," etc., may be thrown upon the printer. It so happens, however, that we have some specimens for which no such excuses can be made. As Provost Stillé has, it seems, only conferred additional glory on the institution whose head he so pompously calls himself, by publishing our private letter, mutilating it, by ignorance or design, in order to prove the horrible charge that we wrote him "a begging letter," there is no code of ethics which forbids us from publishing his English letter, especially as the latter contains nothing " private " or " confidential."

It is now nearly *four* years since we first wrote to the head of the University of Pennsylvania, addressing him as "President," etc., for we did not know his name—had never heard it mentioned. All we requested from him was the privilege of being present at some of the recitations. Having no idea, at this time, that there would be any objection, we kept no copy of our note. In due time, however, we received the following reply:

"UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
"PROVOST'S ROOM

"Philadelphia, May 1 1869

"Edward I Sears Esq LLD.

"Dear Sir:

"I have your letter of the 28th ult: addressed to "the President of Pennsylvania Uneversity," (there is no such person) and I beg to say in reply, that While our arrangements do not permit the presence of Strangers in our recitation rooms during recitation hours, We shall be happy to see you or any one else enterested in the Subject, at the annual public examination of our classes which takes place from the 15th to 20th June next—

Very respectfully
C. J Stillé
Provost
&c

Will the reader believe that this is as nearly a fac-simile of the letter of the Provost of the University of Pennsylvania as our type could make it! Not a word is altered, not a letter, not a point. Then, may we not ask, would not a more decent letter be expected from the clerk of a respectable grocery? Observe that the whole thing is jumbled into one sentence, and such a sentence! The writer of the letter at pp. 99, 100, in our last number, himself a Philadelphian, a scholar, and an author, has been much abused because he speaks of the University graduates as "men who 'know little Latin and less Greek,' and cannot speak five minutes without breaking Priscian's head; men who write decent business letters, but *spell as pleases their own fancy.*" We could have ranked in this category the head of the institution, but "spiteful" and "savage" as we are, we abstained from doing so. Let us ask now has the University of Pennsylvania only one *i?* Is there no *i* in interested; or must we commence that word in future with an *e?* But we shall be told that these are mere mistakes. Be it so; but can the same be said of that curious information given in the parenthesis: "there is no *such person*"*?* We confess this reminded us at once of the individual who, on being addressed by the census numerator: "Are you one of the inmates of this house?" replies rather gruffly, "No, there's none o' them fellows here; I'm Larry, the tailor!" The worst of it is that the Provost was right for once, for he has since proved to the world, in the most satisfactory manner, however unintentionally, that *he* "is no *such* person." It required no great learning to understand that the *president* of a university or college is as much its chief officer or head as *provost.* Any respectable dictionary would have given this information. Thus, for example, Webster defines a provost, one "who is appointed to *superintend* or *preside* over something; a chief magistrate of a city or town, as the provost of Edinburgh, or of Glasgow, answering to the mayor of other cities; the provost of a college *answering to president.*" Then, if we turn to the same authority, we shall find the term president defined as "one who is elected or *appointed to preside; a presiding officer;* a chief authority; a *superintendent,* as the chief officer of a corporation, company, ward, *institution,* society, and the like," etc. In the original Latin also the two terms *præpositus* (provost) and *præses* (president) are used synonymously. Where there is any difference as to the honor conferred by the two terms, it is decidedly in favor of *præses.* In order to illustrate this we need only quote two lines and a half, one from Ovid, the rest from Virgil. Thus the former has in his *Fasti:*

"At puto *præposita* est fuscæ mihi candida *pellex.*"—*Fast.* iii. 493.

The latter in his Æneid:

"Queis Jupiter Anxurus arvis
Præsidet et viridi gaudens Feronia luco."—*Æn.* vii. 800.

Here we see that while Ovid thinks a prostitute good enough to be a provost, Virgil regards the office of president as worthy even of Jupiter. This will doubtless seem a very great difference, and yet we admit the difference is quite as great between the Provost of the University of Pennsylvania and the President of almost any of several colleges we could mention; so that, as already intimated, the parenthetical clause "there is no such person" contains but too much truth.

But we must not linger too long over that curious letter. Eleven months after our "so-called Latin letter" *alias* "mere begging letter" had been sent, we write as follows, in plain English, but without making any allusion to the communication in "an unknown tongue:"

NEW YORK, October 26, 1872.

CHARLES J. STILLÉ, LL. D.

DEAR SIR:

Many friends of your institution have urged on me, from time to time, that I ought to have an article in my Review on the University of Pennsylvania. With this view I wrote to you some two years ago, expressing a wish to visit your class-rooms if agreeable to you. All the principal colleges in the country, including Columbia, Yale, and Harvard have promptly complied with a similar request, but you declined, informing me that I might be present at your annual commencement.

In respectfully inquiring again, now, whether you have any objection to my seeing your system of education in operation, I only comply with the requests of Philadelphians who are patrons of the University. I trust I need hardly say that I would not interfere in any manner with your classes, but merely look on. If you refuse this time I must only obtain my information in the best way I can, and show in my article that the fault of my not being better informed is not mine. I shall also have to publish some of the letters addressed to me on the subject by friends of the institution.

Upon the other hand, I assure you that it is in no other than a friendly spirit, I would visit your class-rooms, if you, like other educators placed in similar positions, would allow me the privilege of doing so. Awaiting the favor of a reply,

I remain,

Very respectfully and truly yours,

EDW. I. SEARS.

In due time we received the following reply, headed with an imposing cut of the new building:

" UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Philadelphia, Oct 30: 1872.

" Dear Sir:

" I shall be happy to *show you our new building*, and the facilities *it* affords for instruction—neither myself nor any *one* of the Professors would have any objection to the *occasional pressence* of a Stranger at a lecture or a recitation *When* the object *was to gain* a *knowledge* of the details of our System were it not that *such a practice* is forbidden by our rules in the interest of the students *themselves.*

" Very resp

"C. J. Stillé"

It is proper to say that the italics are ours, not those of the learned Provost. But in every other particular we present our readers a faithful copy of that gentleman's letter. Then does it need any comment? Do any of our readers need to be informed that a boy ten years old, learning "composition" in one of our common schools, could write a decenter letter—a more sensible and more grammatical letter? Will the reader try to understand "such a *practice*" as "the *occasional* presence" "when the object *was* to *gain*," etc. (!)? We think it will be admitted that the Provost who writes to us in this sort of English may well say that his Latin would be entirely incomprehensible to us; we suspect it will also be admitted without much controversy that his instructions as "Professor of History and English Literature" cannot be of a very high order.

Contrary to its usual courtesy and regard for truth, the Bulletin says that had we been allowed to be present at the recitations of the University of Pennsylvania, we would not have given a fair estimate of them. But when have we pursued such a course toward any institution? With the sole exception of the one under consideration, there is not one of the higher educational institutions of Philadelphia, public or private, male or female, of any denomination, that we cared to see, at which we have not been made welcome and treated courteously. Far from attacking any of these, we have either spoken kindly of them, or not at all. It will be admitted, we think, that the case of Girard college alone would exculpate us from the charge of being actuated only by selfishness and spite. It is now more than ten years since we were *invited* by the President of the board of trustees to visit that institution. All we cared to see was readily and cheerfully shown to us. We wrote and published an article entitled "Girard College and its Founder,"* which speaks for itself to-day, and tells whether we were spiteful or selfish. So far as we are aware we have not to this moment gained one dollar by that institution; yet when or where have we made any attack on Girard College?

---

* **Vide National Quarterly Review, No. XV., December, 1863.**

In seeking information for an article on the treatment of the insane, we applied to Dr. Kirkbride, superintendent of the Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane. Far from having recourse to any quibbles, or offering to instruct us as to the technicalities of titles, that gentleman politely brought his carriage for us to the Continental Hotel, conducted us through the whole institution, afforded us every facility to familiarize ourselves with his mode of discipline, and finally sent his carriage back with us to the hotel. This gentleman can probably tell to-day whether we have ever abused his confidence, or whether we have made any false representation of his system of discipline; he can also tell whether we have ever called to him for as much as one dollar, or received one dollar from him. Since there was then, as there is now, a Dogberry who loved darkness rather than light, it may be neither uninteresting nor irrelevant to extract a passage or two from that article. The following will show how "savage" we were ten years ago:

> "If the reader who has carefully read all the testimony from various sources which we have adduced in this article as to the treatment of the insane even so recently as twenty or twenty-five years ago, will visit some of the principal hospitals for the insane in New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island; such institutions, for example, *as the Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane, Philadelphia;* Butler Hospital for the Insane, Providence. R. I.; State Lunatic Asylum, Utica, N. Y.; State Lunatic Asylum, Worcester, Mass.; Retreat for the Insane, Hartford, Conn.; N. Y. City Lunatic Asylum, Blackwell's Island, etc., then he will be able to form an adequate estimate of the amount of good accomplished within a comparatively brief period.
>
> "Nearly all the asylums just mentioned are among the several which we have visited within the last six months, and in each case their superintendents have evinced a disposition *not only to communicate every important fact relative to the treatment of those under their charge*, but to show us any departments of their institutions which it was proper for us to see. In those instances in which we did not happen to find the superintendents at home, or in which we were not able to visit the asylums, we have been courteously favored with their Reports for years, generally accompanied with the assurance that *any*

further information we might desire for the public benefit would be cheerfully furnished. For the politeness thus shown we have to return *our particular thanks to Drs. Thomas S. Kirkbride,* Isaac Ray, John S. Butler, and Moses H. Ranney; gentlemen who are so well known as eminent physicians and philanthropists, that it is needless for us to mention in connection with their names the institutions to which they belong, and which they have contributed so much to render famous."*

Such was the manner in which we falsified the condition of the institutions which we were permitted fully to examine. The following passage will show what we thought of the Stillé or ostrich plan then, and how we had the "savage"-like assurance to find some fault with the Stillé-Brown theory:

"Indeed, all to whom we have applied on the subject, whether personally or by letter, *with the sole exception of the Superintendent of the Bloomingdale Asylum, cheerfully and promptly furnished us all the statistics within their reach.* Perhaps the only reason why Dr. D. Tilden Brown declined to give us any information relative to his institution was that his time was too valuable. But without going any farther for a comparison, Dr. Ranney, of the Blackwell's Island Asylum, had more than five times as many patients to attend to—an excess of the difference between 805 and 151—and yet the latter not only gave us information cheerfully on every subject in reference to which we sought it, but *accompanied us to every part of the Asylum, explaining or describing as we proceeded whatever seemed to require either.* True, Dr. Brown sent one of his assistants to show us *certain parts* of the house, but the only information worth mentioning given by him was, that a portion of land belonging to the Asylum would be sold for about $20,000. This, however, was not intended for us, but for a gentleman who had much more money at command. It is but justice to Dr. Brown to say that we could not regard his course towards ourselves as any personal discourtesy, since he pursued the same towards the president of a college who brought a fine amateur band, consisting of his own students, to perform before the patients, as it seems he had done more than once before. Kindness and philanthropy like this merited at least a cordial recognition, but the humane president was treated quite as cavalierly as we were ourselves.

---

* "The Insane and their Treatment, Past and Present," National Quarterly Review, No. xiv., September, 1863.

"We must confess it seemed to us that there was an air of mystery about the whole institution; nay, it looked more *like a prison than an asylum.* Not that there were any shackles, fetters, or other iron chains visible; we do not know that any such are used in the institution. But in any of the asylums which we have visited in Europe or America, we have never seen patients *so sullen, sad, and defiant.* It seemed as if most of those at the Bloomingdale *detested* the officers, while those who were in a lighter mood ridiculed them as they passed, but avoided as much as possible being heard or seen. So far as we could judge, without being too inquisitive, only one patient had liberty to go outside the Asylum alone; and this one got charge of our horse and wagon; the assistant-superintendent regarding it as a very funny thing that he drove so briskly around the building, but without making any effort to stop him. We do not wish to make any comment for the present on certain scenes which attracted our attention in the interior of the institution; suffice it to say that while passing one of the corridors one of the most respectable-looking of the patients threw some verses written with a pencil, by a graceful feminine hand, into our hat, of which the following lines will serve as a specimen :

**" Alas! instead of Bloomingdale,
Call this in future weeping vale,
We're here, forsooth, because insane—
Ah no! it is for others' gain,
If sage as Plato, here we'd stay,
While those who sent us agreed to pay."**

Of course in this, too, we were "dishonest." We "attacked the honored superintendent." That much-injured functionary managed to procure a coat of whitewash from some of our newspapers; but if he tried to induce them to abuse us the editors declined that part of the work.

It may, perhaps, be regarded as a curious fact that some of the very journals which then defended Bloomingdale, have within the past year more than corroborated the worst charges we made against that institution ten years ago, so that it stands branded before the world at this moment as exactly the fraudulent thing we described it. Thus we contrasted Dr. Kirkbride, of the Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane, with Dr. Brown, of the Bloomingdale Asylum, ten years ago, just the same as we contrasted Dr. Barnard, of Columbia College, and Dr. Elliot, of Harvard College, with Dr. Stillé, of the University of Pennsylvania, three months ago, and do now!

Nor did we evince any different spirit, or arrive at any different relative conclusions, when we sought information for our article on Prison Discipline—visiting the chief prisons of several States, and writing to the wardens or governors of those which we were unable to visit. We may remark, parenthetically, that it is a singular fact, in view of our recent experience, that of all in charge of those institutions whom we addressed as "governor" or "warden," without giving them their exact title, not one informed us "there is no such person." (!) What is perhaps still more strange, not one of them wrote to us in bad English!

But let us see how we libelled Pennsylvanians in this instance. In order to show how "savage" we were, and how prone to falsification, we beg leave to extract a passage or two from our article. Thus, in discussing the solitary system, we proceed:

> "This change was made at the beginning of 1828, but it was final; the Pennsylvania system has continued essentially the same to the present day. But whatever claim New York or any other State may have in connection with this subject, *let justice be done to Pennsylvania and her philanthropists.* We have already said that we visited the famous Cherry Hill Penitentiary, *strongly influenced* by those *gloomy* and *startling accounts* which we had been reading of it, from time to time, for *twenty years past.*"*

After quoting from the annual reports, politely forwarded to us by the warden, governor, or provost, we continue our comments:

> "We now felt that we could come to no satisfactory conclusion without visiting the establishment. Although often informed that this could not be done without an order from a magistrate, *we had no difficulty whatever.* We were introduced to Mr. Vaux, ex-mayor of

---

* "**Prison Discipline, Past and Present.**"—**N. Q. R., No. XIV., p. 18.**

Philadelphia, and President of the Board of Inspectors of the prison, who was not only *perfectly willing* to admit us, but had the courtesy *to accompany us himself*, and to explain to us every peculiar feature of the institution, as we passed from cell to cell in each department, *concealing nothing*, *evading no query* ; but on the contrary, *inviting investigation*, opening any cell for us that seemed more remarkable than the rest, and taking similar pains to show us the yards attached to the cells on the ground floor." *

That our judgment was not warped, however, will, we think, be seen from the following:

"But no amount of kindness, good intentions, and philanthropy could prevent us from shuddering, as one by one the cells opened, exhibiting their solitary inmates as the impersonations of misery, wretchedness, and despair. Never shall we forget the scenes there presented; nor can we ever recur to them without pain. Not that the unfortunate people seem to *want for anything that a convict ought to expect. All are comfortably and cleanly clad;* they admit themselves that they get *plenty of wholesome food ;* each cell is heated with steam; the ventilation is as good in general as that of any other prison we have seen ; and almost every one we saw *had one or more books or magazines.*

"It is the solitude that seems terrible. We remember nothing more painfully interesting than the eagerness with which nine-tenths of the convicts hastened to look out into the corridor as soon as the thick, close door grated sullenly on its hinges. The few who did not thus rush to the door to get even one glance at the outside world, hid their faces in their beds, as if too sensible of their degradation to let any one see them. In order that they might feel at liberty to speak their minds freely, Mr. Vaux withdrew to some distance whenever *we desired to ask the prisoners any questions.*"†

Before turning our attention to other similar institutions, we give further evidence of our "savage" disposition toward Pennsylvania as follows:

"We might easily add to these instances; but the subject is too painful to dwell upon. That the Inspectors do *all in their power to alleviate the sufferings* of the unfortunates placed under their care, we

---

* "**Prison Discipline, Past and Present.**"—**N. Q. R., No. XIV., Sept. 1863.**

† **Ib.**

have seen every reason to believe. Mr. Vaux brought us into the library, which we were glad to find quite extensive, and to include many of the best standard works. We have certainly no disposition to criticise *anything we saw during our visit. Without being unjust, we could find no fault with the manner in which the institution is managed;* all we can say a word against is the solitary system, *per se.* But to us this seems the worst kind of slavery; if there is any other means by which human life can be more embittered, or human suffering aggravated, without instruments of physical torture, we know nothing of it. Therefore, *believing that there is as much philanthropy and generosity in Pennsylvania* as there is in any other country of equal population, we would earnestly appeal to those who have most influence in the State to *have compassion on the wretched female convicts, if not on the male."* *

Our estimate of Sing Sing, one of the two great State prisons of New York, which we had also visited, was very different from this. The curious reader can find in the same article from which we have just quoted,† our descriptions of several instruments of torture then used which we were permitted to examine; also, a full account of the brutal practice of woman-flogging as given by one of the persons who performed that sort of work. But probably this was "all spite," because the Provost of Sing Sing "declined to advertise in, and subscribe for the National Quarterly Review" (!) Be this as it may, it is a singular fact, "if rightly apprehended," that for our "dishonesty" in this case we had the gratification of receiving many letters of thanks from ladies and gentlemen, not generally regarded as admirers of spiteful or dishonest people; and we have had the still greater gratification of learning that, within one year after we had made our criticisms on Sing Sing, all kinds of physical torture, including woman-flogging, had ceased in that institution.

But we may be permitted to give one other illustration, or two, before we close, of our peculiar mode of manifesting our prejudice and spite against Pennsylvanians. Our readers will remember that we rarely issued a number of our journal while Fisk and Gould had charge of the Erie Railroad in which we did not denounce the dishonest, disreputable practices of those persons. Nor have we shrunk from showing that, while Vanderbilt may not be quite as devoid of honesty as Fisk and Gould, his stock of that virtue is exceedingly slender. Indeed, we never could see much difference between the "Colonel" and the "Commodore," further than that one vulture may be more cunning, if not less ravenous, than another in seizing and devouring its prey. In commenting on the various performances of these personages from time to time, we have more than once contrasted their conduct with that of such officers of the great Pennsylvania roads as Mr. J. Edgar Thompson and Mr. William H. Gatzmer. Nay, have we not often expressed an earnest wish that our principal roads were managed by men so much superior as the latter are to the former, not only in honesty, integrity, intelligence, and gentlemanly deportment, but in all the relations of life?

---

* "Prison Discipline, Past and Present." – N. Q. R., No. XIV., Sept., 1868.

† Ib. Pp. 30, 31.

It is, however, but justice to the Philadelphia papers, which made such a fierce onslaught on us in January last—after having for thirteen years invariably treated us so politely and encouragingly—to admit that they were quite right in supposing that it would do us no harm in Philadelphia or elsewhere. We are sincerely proud to say that, for many years, we have had the honor of numbering not a few of the first and best citizens of Philadelphia among our patrons and friends—precisely the class who confessedly occupy the highest rank, both intellectually and socially. And far from having lost any of these, either on account of our "savage attack" on the University of Pennsylvania, or the storm of newspaper thunder it has brought upon us, incredible though the fact may seem in some quarters, we have gained many new patrons and friends among the same cultivated and honorable class. And what is more, we have no patrons anywhere of a different class; never had. The present number completes the thirteenth year of our journal. In any of the fifty-two quarterly numbers we have issued, who can point out the advertisement of any quack or charlatan, or any advertisement which the most fastidious lady may not read aloud in the drawing room? Even publishers, whose books have a tendency to vitiate the public taste, and who accompany their "editorial copies" with ready-made puffs, discovered long since that our pages are not the place for them. The same is true of colleges and universities. The best in America have been advertised by the year in the National Quarterly; the *sham colleges* or *universities*—those that *love darkness rather than light*—never!

It is also true that many of our old friends, not only in Philadelphia, but throughout Pennsylvania, have letters of ours, which, if so disposed, they might call "begging letters," and publish as such, to show how full of depravity we are! and if they did so, we could neither accuse them of murdering the English language, nor of thrusting themselves into positions for which, as in the case under consideration, they are ludicrously incompetent.

But one word more, before we close, in regard to the defenders of the University of Pennsylvania and its learned Provost. The individual whom we are to consider as more erudite than all the rest has a long dissertation in the Inquirer of January 28, which, "if rightly apprehended," is as amusing as a comedy. Not content with annihilating us, he is terribly severe on our friend the German traveller. "This person," he says, "was guilty of *two barefaced, unblushing*, and wholly gratuitous *fictions*. Dr. Sears gives the fictions in full, declares they *were* fictions, but expects us to receive the subsequent statements *of this mendacious Teuton* as evidence against the University!" We make a thousand apologies to a "certain anonymous German," for having been the cause, however unintentionally, of the abuse poured upon himself and his whole race by this learned person; for what we have quoted is but the smallest part of it. But to those in the secret the most laughable of this gentleman's criticisms is contained in the following sentence:—

> "Near the beginning of his article we have a quotation from Horace—of which more anon—and he concludes with a bit of Euripides, *which he owns he thinks pretty tough*."

Any one who turns to the conclusion of our first *window* article, will see that we make no allusion to either toughness or brittleness. Those who have any knowledge of Greek need not be informed that it was not because the two lines from

Euripides, alluded to, are "pretty tough" or difficult to be translated, that we recommended their being "inscribed in legible characters on a conspicuous slab," etc., but because they give very good advice, "if rightly apprehended;" advice notoriously much needed at the University of Pennsylvania. As the distitch from Euripides has, however, evidently proved still more puzzling than our Latin letter, we inform all whom it may concern, that after giving some illustrations of the injury done to whole communities, as well as to individuals, by bombastic speeches and mutual puffery, the Greek poet concludes with the two lines recommended by us as a motto, and the plain English of which is: "It *behooves us now to understand*, that what we *need* is not *blandishment* that charms the ear, but what excites to *virtuous deed*." We admit, however, that we were entirely wrong in offering the advice in a Greek dress; we fear that even two years hence, Provost Stillé would make a still sadder jumble of it than his now famous construction, "*renunciationem nuntiet.*" But we trust we shall never be too old to learn, or so short-sighted and vain as not to acknowledge that there are innumerable things of which we are ignorant. Accordingly, in order to make amends, as far as possible, for our blunder in recommending a Greek motto for the University of Pennsylvania under its present auspices, we now beg leave, in all humility, to recommend an English motto, which may be posted up in the "Provost's Room," on one of the memorial windows or any other place that may be deemed most suitable for it:

> "Ignorance, indeed, so far as it may be resolved into natural inability, is, as to men at least, inculpable, and consequently not the object of scorn, *but pity*; but in a *governor*, it cannot be without the conjunction of *the highest impudence*; for who bid *such a one* aspire *to teach and to govern?* A *blind man* sitting in the chimney-corner is pardonable enough, *but sitting at the helm he is intolerable.* If men will be *ignorant* and *illiterate*, let them be so *in private*, and *to themselves*, and not *set their defects in a high place*, to *make them visible and conspicuous.* If *owls* will not be *hooted at*, let them *keep close within the tree*, and *not perch upon the upper boughs.*"*

**Ignorance in Power.* An Essay. By the learned Dr. Robert Smith, Orator of Oxford University, London, 1657.

ART. VI.—1. *Considerations on Volcanoes.* By G. POULETT SCROPE. London, 1825. Last Ed. 1871.

2. *Considerations Generales sur les Volcans.* Par M. J. GIRARDIN. Paris, 1831.

3. *Théorie Mathématique de la Chaleur.* Par M. POISSON. 4to. Paris, 1835–1837.

4. *The Eruption of Vesuvius in* 1872. By Prof. LUIGI PALMIERI. With Notes, etc.; by *Robert-Mallet*, Mem. Inst. C. E., F. R. S., F. G. S., M. R. I. S., etc. With Illustrations. 148 pp. 8vo. London: Asher & Co., 1873.

How wonderful is the phenomenon of existence! We see physical nature around us on all sides, and effects which we attribute to the action of mind. Natural things seem to be naturally divided into three great classes: minerals, which possess neither mind nor life; vegetables, which possess life but not mind; and animals, which possess both life and mind. It is difficult, however, to draw the line of distinction between any two consecutive classes as we have given them, for the lichen, which lives on the apparently naked rock, is scarcely raised above the frost-plant which forms on our window-pane; and the animal sponge, which grows attached to a rock beneath the surface of the ocean, seems to be little more than a vegetable. We may thus see existence rising by almost insensible gradations, from the lifeless mineral to the highest order of mundane intelligence.

Notwithstanding the difficulty which we readily see here, of accounting rationally for the general phenomena to which we have alluded, man, in his ignorance of causes, and even of phenomena in their detail, has authoritatively told us how nothing has changed into something, minerals have been created, and afterwards vegetables and animals. Nay, more than that; he has even told us the exact date when all these great changes took place. Those who base their knowledge on the authority of a word, scarcely stop to consider that for infinite duration before the introduction of matter into the universe, or the conversion of a vacuum into a plenum, the great Mind of the universe must have been without employment, at least such as we have any conception of. Mind and matter must have always existed. The universe is subject to continual change, but there is neither creation nor annihilation.

But how different is the story which science tells us! A close scrutiny of the phenomena of nature, as they are successively produced by the changes which take place in the physical world, reveals to us immutable laws which control the operations of the material universe, and even the phenomena of mind, so far as we see it manifested in this world. As yet, at least, we have not been able to discover any exception to this general truth. By observing the facts which the material world presents to us, and comparing them through the medium of the fixed laws of nature, we are carried back to a beginning of the present order of things in our world; but all the facts that we have yet been able to gather make known to us but very little in relation to the amount of time which has been necessary to work all the changes that have taken place, and absolutely nothing respecting the date of the origin of this world. As we have said, science teaches us that there *was* a beginning, and we may truthfully say that we have learned very little respecting the nature of the present order of things.

We might perhaps show with a good degree of reason that what is known as the Nebular Hypothesis has a foundation in the actual operations of nature.* The examination and coordination of the facts observed on the earth and in the heavens, teach us that some process like that implied in the nebular hypothesis has been followed by nature in her method of world-making. Although it cannot be claimed that this is universally admitted among men of science, yet they who view it as a very probable hypothesis are by no means isolated examples. This hypothesis requires that a former condition of the earth was one of fluidity, and that the internal parts may yet be in a highly heated state, if not actually molten. Indeed, until quite recently, the belief has been nearly general that the earth is composed of a solid crust of no great thickness, enclosing a molten interior, which is still the source of the internal fire of the earth. But whether we assume this to be true or not, it is demonstratively certain that portions of the interior of the earth, if not the whole interior, are highly heated, and this heat may properly be spoken of as the *internal fire of our globe.* In relation to the elevated temperature, or even molten state of internal parts of the earth, there is no disagreement; the question in dispute is whether all or only portions are in a fluid condition. But with this part of geological theory, we have but little concern at this time.* Indeed, the proper task of the geologist begins after the earth's crust has assumed its present condition, or one that is in many respects similar. The earliest processes in the formation of a crust, supposing the solidifying process to begin at the surface, could scarcely have left their impress on the existing strata.

---

* See National Quarterly Review, No. XXXII, art. vi.

M. Poisson, in his work on heat, has controverted the doctrines of a high internal temperature. His opinion is, that if the earth ever cooled down from a liquid state to its present condition, the consolidation would have begun at the centre, and not at the surface, as it is generally considered to have done. The temperature which the earth at present exhibits, M. Poisson thinks, is not inherent; that is, it did not originally possess an elevated temperature, but in passing through space, by the motion of the solar sytem, it somewhere reached a position where its temperature was much increased, and the effects of that is what we now observe. This is not only a gratuitous hypothesis, but one which a little consideration will show to be highly improbable. If it should pass sufficiently near a star, or a cluster of stars, to receive heat enough to be so marked in its influence, the mechanical motions communicated to the planets would derange their relative motions about the sun to such an extent that they could be easily traced by mathematical analysis. Besides, the heat would be much more intense than that derived from the sun at present.* The conservation and correlation of force enable us to render a much more satisfactory account of the origin of internal terrestrial temperature.

---

* For a sketch of the early history of geology, and a general view of the formation of the earth, see N. Q. R., No. XLIII., Art. V.

It seems probable that the liquid condition of the earth is at present exhibited approximately by the sun. The formation of a crust would, perhaps, begin in spots, which would many times be re-melted before the existence of a crust would become permanent; and the contraction of the earth, in consequence of cooling, would cause the shell to wrinkle and produce hills and valleys, which would often be destroyed, because it can be shown that such a condition of surface would not be permanent.† Many changes must have taken place before any revolutions could have left their impress so as to be visible in the formations as they now exist. The earth's crust would not be stable, if its thickness were only a few miles, as has heretofore been supposed.

The astronomical phenomenon known as the precession of the equinoxes has, within a few years past,‡ been used to show that the earth must be nearly solid throughout. The precession for a homogeneous shell (which proves to be the same as that for a homogeneous solid earth) is compared with that for a heterogeneous shell, from which the minimum thickness of the shell is deduced, and it is found to be about one thousand miles. Archdeacon Pratt shows that the crushing effect of mountain masses like the Himalayas, and of the crust of the earth itself, is so great that a thickness much less than a thousand miles would not be able to resist it.

While we admit, however, that Mr. Hopkins' numerical results are the most definite of any that have hitherto been deduced, we must not fail to observe that they are based on a hypothetical law of density, namely, that the pressure varies with the square of the density. This law was assumed by Laplace, to enable him to integrate his formulæ for determining theoretically the figure of the earth. The probability that this law is nearly or quite the true law of nature, is very great, yet it would be well if it could be experimentally verified. It serves for determining very correctly, by calculation, the value of the precession of the equinoxes; but all the results are based on the continuity of the law of density, though there is a small probability, when we consider the facts presented by geology, that the *real* law of density is discontinuous somewhere between the surface and the centre, and yet such as to give the same value of the precession.

---

* See Whewell's *Hist. Ind. Sciences*, Vol. iii, p. 612.

† Hopkins' *Philosophical Transactions*, 1839-40-42. Pratt's *Figure of the Earth*, pp. 83-5.

‡ *Figure of the Earth*, p. 86.

Many substances are of such a nature that pressure exerted upon them assists their solidification. The central portions of the earth may, therefore, be solid, even if the temperature be greater than what is required to fuse them at the surface. Mr. Hopkins imagines that the cooled masses—which ordinarilly would sink, owing to their greater specific gravity—would ultimately be prevented from sinking, by the imperfect liquidity of the material beneath. Thus, a solid surface shell would be formed, an interior highly heated solid nucleus, and a liquid stratum between, either continuous or discontinuous, according to circumstances, and of more or less perfect fluidity in different parts.* This seems to be a very probable hypothesis, and one perhaps that will account for all, or the most of the volcanic and earthquake phenomena of the present era, and of such as the earth's crust exhibits as having taken place in former times.

As an evidence that the interior of the earth has a much higher temperature than the surface, the geologist finds a gradual increase in the height of the thermometer as it is carried farther below the earth's surface. Very many experiments have been made on mines and artesian wells, and they all show an increase of temperature as we descend. Objections have been raised in relation to the results obtained in mines, since the breath of the miners, the heat given out by lamps, and the explosion of gunpowder, would necessarily add something to the natural heat in the mines; but, on the other hand, the circulation of cold air through the shafts of the mines would tend to counteract the effects of the above causes.

---

*We may add that the different rates of increase of temperature, presently to be noticed, in descending towards the centre, as observed in mines and artesian wells, seems to favor the unequal distribution of heat and fusible and conducting material, in the interior portions of the earth, which lie about the liquid streams.

Solar heat is the principal cause of the superficial temperature of the earth, and we may readily conclude that its effects are felt to some distance beneath the terrestrial surface. Baron Fourier fixes 130 feet as the maximum depth, and M. Poisson gives 76 feet. The diurnal effect does not extend much below three or four feet. According to some experiments made by Professor Forbes, near Edinburgh, the annual oscillations of temperature would cease at the depth of 49 feet in trap tufa, 62 feet in incoherent sand, and 91 feet in compact sandstone.

From observations on springs in mines in Saxony, Brittany, Cornwall, and Mexico, the average number of feet of descent necessary to raise the thermometer (Fah.) one degree, varies from 45 to 351 feet, with a general average of fourteen localities of 92 feet. Observations on the temperature of the rocks in various localities in Europe give a rather more rapid increase, the numbers varying between 31 and 174 feet, for an increase of one degree. Observations on artesian wells give slightly different results.

Some very careful experiments made by Prof. Philips in two shafts, one near Durham and the other near Manchester, each of them 2,000 feet deep, give an increase of 1° Fahrenheit for every 65 to 70 feet.* Mr. Fox fixed a thermometer in the rock of the Dolcoath mine, in Cornwall, at the depth of 1,380 feet, and observed it frequently for a year and a half, and his result was that there is an increase of 1° for every 75 feet.† According to the result at which M. Cordier arrived in his numerous experiments and observations, there is

---

*Lyell's *Principles of Geology*, Vol. ii, p. 805. †Ibid.

in general a rapid increase of heat in descending; but the increase does not follow the same law in all parts of the earth; nor does there appear to be any law dependent on either the latitude or longitude. He thinks that we may take an increase of 1° Fah. for every 45 feet, as a general average that will be not far from the truth.*

An artesian well in Charleston, South Carolina, bored to the depth of 1,106 feet, gives an average increase of 1° Fah. for 52 feet of descent, but the heat does not increase regularly with the depth, but it was greatest about those places at which streams of water were encountered.

But we have already given a sufficient number of observations to show the general result to which they lead, namely, a gradual increase of temperature from the surface of the earth towards the centre, to the greatest depth yet attained. If we assume as the most probable average result that there is an increase of 1° Fah. for an increasing depth of every 60 feet, we shall not be far from the truth. This increase of temperature is sufficient, as we may easily see, to carry us, after a few miles of descent, to a point where all known rocks would be fused if the conditions were the same as at the surface; and this has led many geologists, heretofore, to the conclusion that, except a crust of quite limited thickness, the earth is in a molten condition. But the greater number of the substances which compose the earth's crust have their fusing-points raised, as we have already mentioned, by pressure; and since the pressure exerted at great depths must be enormous, and it increases with the depth, we see that the melting-point will descend lower and lower, and at what temperature that point will be reached we cannot at present tell.

The hypothesis of a molten nucleus of great extent led geologists very legitimately to the conclusion that igneous causes of change were formerly much more powerful and active than at present. If we extend our period back sufficiently we shall most certainly arrive at such a time; but that any effects of such action have left their impress on existing strata may

---

**Mem. de l'Institut de France*, tom. vii.

well be questioned; that is, to the extent that has generally been supposed.

It seems difficult for scientific men to rid themselves of the idea that nature is limited in time in performing her operations. Thus it was that the earlier geologists imagined changes in the earth's crust to take place with violence, and in short periods of time, since it was thought necessary to limit the time during which the earth's crust was assuming its present condition to a comparatively short period. So much for the influence which a myth has exerted on the progress of science. The advance of physical science is measureably in proportion to the liberation of the human mind from the bondage of authority.*

Dr. James Hutton, towards the close of the last century, introduced quite a new order of investigations, by endeavoring to show that existing causes are sufficient as far as we can legitimately look, when we would account for the existing order and arrangement observable in the structure of the crust of the earth. Playfair still further illustrated and explained, in elegantly written works, the ideas of Hutton. In still more recent times Lyell has, by his patient investigations, varied acquirements, and learned works on the subject, done much to show that causes now in operation are well-nigh sufficient to produce all the phenomena observable in the mineralogical structure of the earth. Still we must not forget to call the attention of the reader to the fact—exemplified in many ways—that he who attempts to push a theory to its utmost extent is in danger of not seeing all facts in their true light. We are too apt to jump from one extreme to another, leaving some one else, who can philosophically view both sides, to draw the legitimate conclusion from the whole range of existing facts. It is difficult to take into consideration all known causes, powerful and weak, and allow for them to the extent, neither more nor less, which the nature of the case requires.

---

* The authority of Newton in retarding the progress of physical optics has been referred to by Prof. Tyndall in his recent lectures in New York; but the influence of theologic cosmogony in retarding the progress of geologic science by preventing the otherwise philosophic mind from making the best use of the facts of nature, has been still more marked.

Although the influence of causes now in operation is probably sufficient to produce, the time being unlimited, by far the greater part of the changes which have taken place in past ages, in the earth's crust, yet it seems to be highly probable that igneous causes, at least, were, in the early periods of the earth's physical history, rather more powerful and active than in more modern periods. Some proof of this will be given in its proper place.*

The principal inequalities of the earth's surface have been produced by the action of igneous causes acting from beneath the surface. Water is, and it has been, a powerful agent in changing the general features which we observe, but it is a great leveller, and never, with some insignificant exceptions, produces superficial inequalities. Water loosens the materials on which it acts, and thus enables the force of gravity to bring them to lower levels, and in this way produce a general equilibrium of surface. Igneous forces, on the other hand, in general tend to produce inequalities of the surface by elevating, which may cause depressions in others. Three-quarters of a century ago, geologists had but little correct knowledge respecting the structure of mountains and mountain chains, and of the causes which elevated them. Pallas and De Saussure, near the close of the last century, made some useful observations on the general structure of mountains; but it was not till the time of Von Buch, and after him M. Elis de Beaumont, that much progress was made in the investigation of the anatomical structure of mountains, if the expression may be allowed. According to the observations of Beaumont, the older strata, or those which are in general found lowest in the series, lying next to the granite core of the mountain, are inclined as if they had been raised up when the mountain was elevated; while resting on these are others and newer strata which have a horizontal position. Thus it would appear that by observing the kind of strata which are inclined, and those which are horizontal, we can determine the relative ages of mountains and mountain systems; for if some of the older series of strata were horizontal in one case, and inclined in another, our legitimate conclusion from these data would be that the latter mountains were elevated more recently than the former; while both might be older than other mountains which show an inclination of still newer strata. These were the principles which guided M. de Beaumont in his extensive generalizations on this subject.*

---

* The present physical constitution of the sun is a type on a grand scale of what the earth once was, if the nebular hypothesis has a foundation in nature. The solar spots are perhaps vast islands or continents, which are formed by the cooling of parts of the solar surface, and then by sinking they again become melted. The early islands and continents on the earth were probably subjected to such vicissitudes.

In some cases, and perhaps many, the strata are not only inclined, but they are folded and contorted as if they had been subjected to a powerful lateral pressure while they were in a plastic state. Whatever theory of mountain formation we adopt, it must account for this plication of strata. Our theories are often defective for the want of properly conducted experiments under conditions as nearly resembling those which nature presents as possible. The observations and experiments of Sharpe, Sorby, Houghton and Tyndall, show quite conclusively that slaty cleavage is due to pressure acting under particular circumstances, the resulting planes of cleavage being perpendicular to the direction of the force of pressure. Tyndall shows that a fine clay or almost any impalpable material, when subjected to pressure, and allowed at the same time to spread laterally, assumes a laminated structure. These facts are of high importance in explaining the formation and structure of mountain masses.

Observations on the strata surrounding mountain masses show, as has already been mentioned, that they are often much curved and distorted, as if they had become somewhat softened, and then subjected to great pressure. These distortions are especially found in the older strata. The continual denudation of exposed strata has changed their outward appearance very much. In many cases newer strata have been formed covering the inclined and curved ones, the former being horizontal. All hypotheses, the object of which is to explain the *modus operandi* of the formation of mountain systems, take into consideration this distortion of strata, but in nearly every one it is made a subordinate part of the theory. One recently proposed by Professor Joseph Le Conte makes this folding of strata the principal cause which immediately gives rise to the elevation of mountain chains. Since this hypothesis seems at present to be by far the most plausible of any yet imagined, we shall briefly explain its general features.

---

* *Systèmes de Montagnes*, 1852. "Dictionnaire universelle d'Hist. naturelle," tome xii.

Suppose, then, the earth has reached, in the process of cooling, a condition some such as we have already explained, namely, a solid crust sufficiently stable to be no longer subject to such changes as would destroy any part of it, while beneath it the heat was sufficiently great to maintain some portions in a molten condition, or at least possibly so, the great nucleus beneath being perhaps mainly solid from a loss of temperature and from pressure. The liquid parts would be perhaps rather streams than a continuous stratum, extending completely around all parts of the earth. Surrounding space, notwithstanding the influence of the sun, would still be so much colder than the earth, that the refrigeration of it would yet continue, and the earth, as a whole, must grow smaller by contraction. The outer crust—whose thickness would necessarily be limited to a very few miles—would be so nearly cold with respect to surrounding space that the heat which it received from the interior would be radiated from its external surface without the temperature of the crust itself being much increased or diminished. Such a crust could not possibly be sufficiently self-supporting to be maintained as a shell, disconnected from the interior and much more heated nucleus. The result would be that the crust would give way in some parts by sinking down, and in others by rising up, thus changing the level surface into hollows and elevations, or, if this did not take place, the crust would be *crushed* together in the weaker parts, and forced up above the general level, and thus form mountain chains. The first supposition is untenable, since the elevated portions of the crust would be brought to a lower level by the force of gravity alone; so that, if such a condition of things were possible, it could not long be maintained. According to the other supposition, the parts where the crushing together took place would gradually become thicker (for these changes could not be sudden in any ordinary sense of the word), and more and more unyielding, until an equilibrium was reached. We easily see that these changes would either produce plication of strata if plastic, or broken strata if rigid. We, therefore, find that the immediate cause of the elevation of mountain ranges is the folding and bending up of strata. The subjacent matter would effectually prevent any great amount of increase of thickness downward.

This hypothesis of the origin of mountain masses explains in a very satisfactory manner the origin of slaty cleavage. This cleavage exists in most mountains. According to the experiments already cited, where a great pressure was applied to plastic clay, a cube of the material would, on the average, according to Professor Le Conte, be crushed from two and a half miles into one, and, by supposing the whole extension in a vertical direction, 10,000 feet of thickness would be pressed into 25,000 feet, or an increase in thickness of 15,000 feet, which would produce a mountain of considerable elevation.

Professor Hall was the first to draw special attention to the fact that mountain chains are composed of immense masses of sediments, even much thicker than the mountains themselves. We hence see that what are mountain masses now were once the bottom of seas of greater or less extent, for the sediment must have been deposited at the bottom of bodies of water. Where the Appalachian chain now stands, there existed an ancient ocean, called by geologists the *Paleozoic Sea*. The sediment deposited in this sea, and which now forms the Appalachian range, was washed largely from a great continental mass lying to the north, called the Laurentian area. A discussion of the facts in relation to the mountains lying in the western part of this continent leads to similar conclusions in regard to their origin. After the Rocky Mountains were formed, where the Sierras now exist a sea probably existed, and after the elevation of the latter range the sea-coast was removed to the west considerably further, and succeeding this change, the coast range was formed, and the great Pacific Ocean is the sea which now washes the western margin of this continent.

Extensive chains of mountains, like the Rocky and the Andes, were, then, according to this view, raised up from the bottom of extensive seas; and we may conclude that smaller and irregular ranges are the sediment deposited in interior seas of less extent. The reader will now ask how it is that sea-bottoms are more likely to become the lines along which the surface yields to the horizontal thrust, as we have explained. This we shall explain in a few words. Mr. Babbage and Sir John Herschel first drew attention to the fact that the interior heat of the earth would extend itself into the sediment, which, as we have seen, accumulates to a great depth. Thus the influence of the water and the interior temperature would soften the ocean beds and cause them to yield to the pressure exerted by the contraction of the earth, and in due course of time the mountain would be produced. According to this view, the beds of the two great oceans may be now rising; and soundings in the Gulf stream lend some plausibility to this view.

Professor De Conte sums up in relation to this hypothesis as follows: "It explains satisfactorily the following facts. 1. The most usual position of mountain chains near continental coasts. 2. When there are several *ranges* belonging to one system, they have usually been formed successively coast-ward. 3. Mountain chains are masses of immensely thick sediments. 4. The strata of which mountains are composed are strongly folded, and where the materials are suitable, affected wifh slaty cleavage, both the folds of the cleavage planes being usually parallel to the mountain chain. 5. The strata of mountain chains are usually affected with metamorphism, which is great in proportion to the height of the mountains and the complexity of the foldings. 6. Great fissure-eruptions and volcanoes are usually associated with mountain chains. 7. Many other phenomena—such as fissures, slips, earthquakes, and the subsidence preceding the elevation of mountains, it equally accounts for." We may further add that it accounts for the existence of marine shells on the tops of mountains.

Fissure-eruptions, to which reference has been made, are phenomena which afford good proof that igneous causes were once more active in modifying the present appearance of the earth than they are at present. The great amount of lava that exists in the Sierras and the coast ranges, and especially in the former, renders it impossible that it could have flowed from volcanic craters. In the middle of California immense separate streams of lava begin, but in the northern part these become a general flood not less than two or three hundred feet thick, and this continues through Oregon where the flood of lava is still more extensive, and the thickness has increased to two thousand feet; thence on through Washington Territory and into British Columbia to an unknown distance, the whole embracing an area seven or eight hundred miles long, and eighty to a hundred in width. The lava has completely covered this tract, and where the Columbia river cuts through it, it is from two thousand to three thousand feet thick. There are a score, perhaps, of extinct volcanoes scattered over this area, but it seems impossible that the great amount of lava to which we have referred could have ever flowed from their craters.

Supposing the preceding theory to be approximately correct, it may not usually happen that mountains are still rising in any given period of time, though there seems to be some evidence that the Andes are still increasing in elevation above the level of the sea. It seems that they have been gradually rising century after century at the rate of several feet, while the pampas on the east have been raised only a few inches in the same time.* If there be liquids and gases beneath the earth's surface, the pressure exerted by the contraction of the crust might cause them to change their position. If one part of the crust should sink (and this might take place if the equilibrium of the forces in action were disturbed), the fluid parts would be driven in greater quantities to other places, and this process would assist in lifting up other parts. That the molten material does change its position is indicated by Vesuvius and such volcanoes as seem to have been extinct for many centuries, but afterwards become active. Extinct volcanoes, at present so called, also indicate the same thing, especially if volcanoes are as numerous now as in former periods.*

---

* Lyell's *Prin. of Geol.*, Vol 1., p. 129.

The unstableness of the apparently solid crust of our globe is shown by the fact now well settled, that parts of the Scandinavian peninsula are gradually rising, while other parts seem to be gradually sinking. The Swedish naturalist, Celsius, early in the eighteenth century, gave his opinion that the waters of the Baltic sea and the Northern ocean were gradually sinking. From numerous observations he inferred that the rate of depression was about thirty-nine inches in a century. Several objections were raised against these conclusions, and some of the proofs given by Celsius were immediately controverted by the philosophers of his day.

Since the time of Celsius, however, it has been conclusively proved that the relative height of the land and water is variable. In 1807, after an examination of the Scandinavian peninsula, M. Von Buch makes this statement: "It is certain that the level of the sea cannot subside; the equilibrium of the waters forbids it. Yet the phenomenon of their retreat is no less unquestionable, and there remains but one admissible idea —that of a general upheaval of the land from Frederickshall to Abo, and perhaps to St. Petersburg." At the suggestion of Celsius, marks had been cut in the rocks at Pefle and Calmar; and Linnæus had also traced a level on a block, which he describes with precision. In one place a maritime city had become an inland one, and in another an arm of the sea had become transformed into a highway. All these facts led the people of the country to the belief that the waters were diminishing. The conclusion of Von Buch, which we have just given, was the first expressed by a practical geologist after a personal examination.

---

* **That mountain chains have been the yielding line in the shrinking of the crust, *because* the solid parts were thinner, and more molten matter beneath, is rendered probable by the fact that mountains are often volcanoes, and many have been, but they are now extinct, the liquid having solidified.**

The observation of Lyell in 1834, and MM. Levén, Erdmann, and Nordenskiöld, since then lead to the same conclusion as that expressed by Von Buch. "After a review of all that has been said and published on this subject since the commencement of this century," says Lyell, "I am inclined to believe, with the pilots, fishermen, and engineers, that a slow alteration in the relative level of land and sea is taking place along certain parts of the Swedish coast."* The elevatory force, however, has not been constant in its action, but intermittent, with long pauses of rest.†

Since Scandinavia has been comparatively free from violent earthquakes within the times of authentic history, the rise of land there seems a strange phenomenon; but in the southern part it seems to be subsiding. Observations in Greenland show that a portion of that country also is subsiding.‡ The instances to which we have now referred are sufficient to show that these slow changes in the relative level of the land and water, if continued in the same direction, will in the course of time produce new continents and islands, and new ocean beds. Man, continually adapting himself to these changes, scarcely perceives that they are taking place. It is the sudden changes which sometimes affect large though limited areas, that more especially attract man's attention, and teach how unstable is the solid earth on which he lives. These changes are brought about by earthquakes, which seem to affect, at one period of time or another, nearly, if not quite, every region of country on the globe. "Earthquakes manifest themselves by quick and successive vertical, or horizontal, or rotatory vibrations. In the very considerable number of earthquakes which I have experienced in both hemispheres, alike on land and at sea, the two first-named kinds of motion have often appeared to me to occur simultaneously. The mine-like explosion—the vertical action from below upwards—was most strikingly manifested in the overthrow of the town of Riobamba in 1797, when the bodies of many of the inhabitants were found to have been hurled to Cullca, a hill several hundred feet in height and on the opposite side of the river Lican."* Such is a brief general description of the motion of the earth's crust during an earthquake. Earthquakes are among the most fearful phenomena which are recorded in the history of our planet. Volcanoes are much more local in their nature, however violent their eruptions may sometimes be, and man can much more easily escape from them. Earthquakes often come suddenly upon him, and he knows not whither to flee to place himself beyond their immediate reach.

---

* *Principles of Geology*, Vol. ii., p. 188.

† Id., pp. 195–6.

‡ Id., pp. 196–7.

Earthquakes differ greatly in intensity. Sometimes the agitation produced is so weak that it is sensible only to those who are accustomed to such phenomena. At other times, however, they are so terrific that the earth reels and trembles as if its foundations were about to give way; cities are destroyed, whole districts laid waste, and the entire aspect of a country is in a few moments changed—its mountains are overthrown, its rivers are changed from their courses or are dried up, and lakes are suddenly engulfed. "From our infancy," says Humboldt, "the idea of certain contrasts fixes itself in our mind; water appears to us an element that moves—earth a motionless and inert mass. These ideas are the effects of daily experience; they are connected with every thing that is transmitted to us by the senses. When a shock is felt, when the earth is shaken on its old foundations, which we had deemed so stable, one instant is sufficient to destroy long illusions. It is like awakening from a dream, but a painful awakening. We feel that we have been deceived by the apparent calm of nature—we become attentive to the least noise—we distrust for the first time a soil on which we had so long placed our feet with confidence. If the shocks be repeated, if they become frequent during successive days, the uncertainty quickly disappears. In 1784 the inhabitants of Mexico were as accustomed to hear the thunders roll beneath their feet as we are to witness the vivid flash in the region of the clouds. Confidence easily springs up in the human mind, and we end by accustoming ourselves to the undulations of the ground, like the sailors to the tossing of the ship caused by the motion of the waves."

---

* Humboldt, in *Cosmos*, vol. i., p. 199. This powerful vertical movement would seem to indicate the action of confined gases.

Although we are quite unaccustomed to the phenomena of earthquakes, yet they are so numerous, when the whole earth is considered, that scarcely a day passes without some place on the globe being visited by one or more of them. If such be the case in our day, we may readily conclude that they have been equally numerous in all ages of the world. There is no class of physical phenomena which are attributable to igneous causes, that produces so sudden and extensive changes in the earth's crust as earthquakes.

In 1692 the island of Jamaica was visited by a violent earthquake, during which the ground swelled and heaved like the rolling sea. The earth was traversed by numerous cracks, as many as two or three hundred being often seen at one time, opening and closing again. Many people were swallowed up in these rents, some caught about the middle and squeezed to death. In other cases the heads of persons only appeared above the ground, and some were first engulfed and then cast up with great quantities of water. The devastation was general, and in the town of Port Royal, then the capital, where more houses were left standing than in all the rest of the island, three-fourths of the houses and the ground on which they stood sank down with their inhabitants entirely under water.*

The small island of Sorea, one of the Moluccas, consists of one great volcano, which was in eruption in 1693. Different parts of the cone fell in, one after another, and the crater,

---

*Lyell's *Prin. Geol.*, Vol. ii, p. 160.

which now covered nearly half the island, was converted into a fiery lake. The shocks of the earthquake which attended this catastrophe became less frequent as the fiery lake extended its boundaries.* In the same year, on the 11th of January, the city of Catania and forty-nine other places in the island of Sicily were levelled to the ground by shocks of earthquakes, and about 100,000 people were killed. In 1698, July 19th, during an earthquake in Quito, a great part of the crater and summit of the volcano Carquaivazo fell in, and a stream of water and mud flowed from the broken sides of the hill. In 1699, January 5th, a terrific earthquake visited the island of Java, and no less than 208 considerable shocks were reckoned.

On the 28th of October, 1746, there occurred in Peru a most violent earthquake. No less than two hundred shocks were experienced during the first twenty-four hours. Twice the ocean retired, and returned with great force upon the land. Twenty-three ships and vessels were in the harbor of Callao, nineteen of which were sunk, and the other four were carried by the force of the waves a great distance up the country, and there left on dry land at a considerable height above the sea. The city of Lima was destroyed, and a part of the coast near Callao was converted into a bay. Four other harbors shared a similar fate. Only two hundred inhabitants out of 4,000 in the city were saved. In 1751 an earthquake in Chili destroyed the ancient town of Conception, or Penco, and the sea rolled over it.

One of the most terrific earthquakes of modern times is that which commenced at Lisbon, on the 1st of November, 1755. The first warning which the inhabitants had of the coming danger was a rumbling sound like thunder, which seemed to be underground. This preceded by only a moment a tremendous shock which threw down the greater part of the city. About 60,000 persons perished in the course of about six minutes. Those who survived the first shock, which was immediately followed by two others, fled so precipitately

---

*De la Buche's *Manual of Geology*, p. 133, 2d ed.

that they scarcely stopped to remove a stone from their dearest friend, though many might have been saved by such timely assistance. Nothing but self-preservation seemed to have been thought of. "Those lost in houses and streets," says Mr. Wolfall, "were very unequal to those that were buried in the ruins of churches; for as it was a day of great devotion, and the time of celebrating mass, all the churches were vastly crowded, and the number of churches here exceeds that of both London and Westminster; and as the steeples are built high, they mostly fell with the roof of the church, and the stones are so large that few escaped. I lodged in a house where there were thirty-eight inhabitants, and only four were saved. In the city prison eight hundred were lost, twelve hundred in the general hospital, and a great number of convents of four hundred each. The palace tumbled the first shock, but the natives insist that the Inquisition was the first building that fell down." The first shock was felt at nine o'clock and forty minutes in the morning.

As misfortunes rarely come single-handed, a conflagration was added to the horrors of the earthquake. During the whole of the following winter, the people of Lisbon had no better dwellings than the tents which they erected in the fields. As great as the suffering was, it must have been greater had not the charity of others relieved their more pressing wants. The English parliament granted a large sum of money, grain, wearing apparel, blankets, and other things were added. Spain, also, rendered all the assistance in her power.

During this shock the sea first retired and laid dry the bar; it then rolled in and rose fifty feet or more above its ordinary level. The mountains of Arribida, Estrella, Julio, Marvan, and Cintra, some of the largest in Portugal, were violently shaken, and some of them opened at their summits, which were split and torn in a wonderful manner, large masses of them being thrown down into the subjacent valley.* According to Humboldt,† a portion of the earth's surface, four times as great as that of Europe, was simultaneously shaken." The shock was felt on the coast of Sweden, on the shores of the Baltic, in Thuringia, in Northern Germany, in the Alps, and in Great Britain. Also in the West Indies, in the great lakes between Canada and the United States; and in the north of Africa, where, about eight leagues from Morocco, it is said that a village with its inhabitants, numbering about eight or ten thousand persons, was swallowed up, the earth soon afterwards closing over it. Besides these places, the shock was felt a considerable distance at sea off the coasts of Spain and Portugal. The movements of the earth travelled at the rate of about twenty miles a minute.

---

* *Principles of Geology*, Vol. ii, p. 147. † *Cosmos*, Vol. i, p. 206.

The earthquake of Calabria, which began in February, 1783, is about the only one that occurred in the last century, whose history and circumstances have been so fully related as to assist, very materially, the geologist in understanding the effects which such phenomena produce on the general features of the earth's surface, during the lapse of centuries.* Although shocks were felt during four years (to the end of 1786), yet in duration and extent this earthquake was not particularly remarkable as compared with what have been experienced in other countries during the last or the present century.

According to Pignataro, a physician residing at Monteleone, a town in the centre of the convulsions, there were, in 1783, 949 shocks, of which he calls 501 of the first degree, and in 1784 there were 151, of which 98 were of the first order with respect to force. Although a considerable extent of territory was shaken, yet only about five hundred square miles of surface were so violently disturbed as to excite intense alarm. That part of Italy is chiefly composed, according to Lyell, of argillaceous strata of great thickness, containing marine shells and sometimes associated with beds of sand and limestone. It seems highly probable that the violence of earthquake shocks is dependent to a considerable extent on the nature of the strata which are disturbed. According to the observations made by Mr. Sharpe at Lisbon, in 1837, the destructive effects of the great earthquake of 1755 were confined to the tertiary strata, and were most violent on the blue clay, on which the lower part of the city rests. According to him, not a building on the secondary limestone or the basalt was injured.*

---

* See on this subject Vivenzio's *Istoria de' Tremuoli della Calaberia, del* 1783; Grimaldi's *Descriz de' Tremuoli Accad. nelle Calabria* nel 1783. Also see Lyell's *Prin. Geol.* vol. ii. Chap. xxix.

The first shock (of February 5th, 1783) threw down the greater part of the houses in all the cities and towns and villages, where the destruction was greatest, and convulsed the whole surface of the country. All this took place in the course of two minutes. Another shock occurred on the 28th of March following, of nearly equal violence. During the first shock the granite chain of mountains, which pass through Calabria from north to south, and attain an elevation of several thousand feet, was but little shaken; but during the second shock it was much more disturbed.

During the Calabrian earthquake numerous fissures were produced, changes of level occurred, and many other changes took place which we have not the space to describe, but for details we refer the reader to the authorities already cited. According to Sir William Hamilton about 40,000 persons perished during the earthquake, and about 20,000 more died by the epidemics which were probably caused by the want of sufficient nourishment and the inhalation of malarious poison which arose from the now stagnant lakes and pools that had been produced.

We have space to do but little more than refer to some of the more recent earthquakes, whose effects on the earth's surface and its inhabitants have been very marked. Previous to the terrific earthquake of 1812, which destroyed the cities of La Guayra and Caraccas, shocks were felt in South Carolina and the valley of the Mississippi, from the village of New Madrid, in Missouri, to the mouth of the Ohio, in one direction, to that of the St. Francis in the other.† The graveyard at New Madrid was precipitated into the bed of the Mississippi river, and the ground on which the town is built, and the river bank for fifteen miles above, sunk eight feet below their former level. The forest near presented a curious appearance, "the trees standing inclined in every direction, and many having their trunks and branches broken." The earth rose in great undulations, and, after reaching a fearful height, the soil burst and great volumes of water, sand, and pit-coal were discharged as high as the tops of the trees. The shocks continued during three successive months, the only instance on record, according to Humboldt, where such a thing has happened far from any volcano.

---

* *Proceedings of the Geological Society*, No. 60, p. 36, 1838.

† For an account of the earthquake of New Madrid in 1811, see the narrative of an eye-witness, in *Smithsonian Report* for 1858, pp. 421-424.

On the 26th of March, 1812, the city of Caraccas and 10,000 of its inhabitants were destroyed. Humboldt has recorded in his narrative of a journey to the equinoctial regions all that he could collect. It being Holy Thursday, a large part of the inhabitants was collected in the churches. The calamities of the day were not preceded by any warnings, and the destruction of life was in consequence the more complete.

As an illustration of the great force exerted during earthquake shocks, we may mention that in the great earthquake of 1822, in Chili, during which the alterations of level extended to 100,000 square miles of surface, Lyell estimates, calling the average rise three feet, that the amount of rock added to the continent equalled in weight 100,000 times that of the Great Pyramid of Egypt, the weight of the latter being equal to 6,000,000 tons; and if we consider that perhaps two miles instead of three feet of thickness (and it might have been much more) were lifted, the whole force exerted was equal to the weight of 363,000,000 pyramids.*

The earthquake of August 13–16, 1868, which occurred along the South American Pacific coast, for the extent and violence of it, as well as destructiveness to life and property, has scarcely been equalled by any that has happened since its settlement by Europeans. The whole western coast, from the

---

* *Prin. Geology*, vol. ii., p. 97,

United States of Columbia to Chili, was shaken, and cities and towns in great numbers were suddenly laid in ruins, either by the shocks or by the subsequent influx of the sea, or by both combined. The shocks commenced on the 13th, about 5 o'clock P. M. The centre of disturbance seemed to be in the southern part of Peru. The shocks lasted in different places from two to seven minutes. The city of Arequipa, about forty miles from the coast, contained a population of about fifty thousand. The disturbance was so great there that the city was almost totally destroyed. The churches were solidly built of stone, yet not one was left standing. Arica in Peru, the chief port for the commerce of Bolivia, was both destroyed by the earthquake and obliterated by the sea. Five ships lay at anchor in the bay, and all but one were destroyed with the greater part of their crews. The United States war-steamer *Wateree* was swept a quarter of a mile inland, and left high and dry, with the loss of but one man. It was estimated that from thirty to sixty thousand persons were destroyed. The yellow fever broke out in Arica in November, 1868, and this terrible scourge carried off more than twenty-five hundred, and thus, by its ravages, added vastly to the horrors of the earthquake.*

Volcanoes and earthquakes are intimately related, but the former, as causes of change in the surface of the earth, are of much less importance in a geological point of view than the latter. The history of the eruptions of Vesuvius, since the re-commencement of its activity, in the year 79 of our era, is perhaps better known than that of any other volcano. By studying its phenomena, geologists may learn, perhaps, the general physical history of all active volcanoes. Volcanoes are very numerous, several hundreds of them being known. According to recent investigations there are four hundred and ten, a large proportion of which are on islands, and nearly all continental volcanoes are situated near the sea coast. This fact is of importance in explaining the cause of eruptions.

The geographical boundaries of the volcanic regions of the globe are widely extended. If we begin with the southern part of South America, we find volcanoes distributed in greater or less frequency throughout the greater part of the Andean chains. The loftiest known volcanoes exist in this region. The volcanoes of Quito, which occur between the second degree of south and the third degree of north latitude, are very lofty, rising to elevations of fourteen thousand to eighteen thousand feet above the level of the sea. Cotopaxi, the highest of all the South American volcanoes that have been in a state of eruption in modern times, has an altitude of eighteen thousand eight hundred and fifty-eight feet. It is a perfect cone, and usually covered with great beds of snow, which, however, have sometimes been melted during an eruption, as happened in January, 1803, when the snows were dissolved in one night. The eruptions of this great volcano have been more frequent and more destructive than those of any other mountain. In 1738, its flames rose nearly three thousand feet above the crater, and in 1744 its roarings were heard as far as Honda, on the Magdalena, a distance of six hundred and ninety miles; and in 1803, Humboldt and Bonpland heard the explosions at the port of Guayaquil, night and day, a distance of one hundred and eighty miles, as if they were the distant discharge of a battery.

---

* See *Smithsonian Report* for 1870, p. 421-24.

Great floods are often caused in the Andes by the melting of vast bodies of snow, a result of the internal fire of the mountains; and sometimes earthquakes rend subterranean cavities which are filled with water. During these inundations fine volcanic sand, loose stones, and other materials, are swept along by the water in its descent, and thus an immense amount of mud is formed and carried into the lower regions. Mud thus formed descended in 1797, from the sides of Tunguragua in Quito, and filled valleys a thousand feet wide to the depth of six hundred feet. Rivers were dammed up by it, and lakes were thus formed. Large quantities of small fish are in this way enveloped by the mud, and sometimes they are left in subterranean cavities of water, where, according to Humboldt,* they multiply, " and when the shocks of earthquakes, which precede all eruptions in the Andes, have violently shaken the whole mass of the volcano, these subterranean caverns are suddenly opened, and water, fishes, and tuffaceous mud are all ejected together." The putrid fever, which raged in 1691 in the mountain town of Ibarra, north of Quito, was attributed to the effluvia which arose from the putrid fish which were ejected from the volcano of Imbaburu.

---

* *Cosmos*, vol. i. pp. 230–31.

In North America we find volcanoes to exist in the West Indies, in Mexico, in the northwestern part of the United States, and in Alaska Territory. Another chain of volcanos commences in the Aleutian Islands, extends westerly nearly two hundred geographical miles, then southward, with a few interruptions, between sixty and seventy degrees of latitude to the Moluccas. From this point it sends off a branch to the southeast, the principal line extending westerly through Sumbana, Java, to Sumatra, thence in a northwesterly direction to the Bay of Bengal.* The volcanoes of the East Indian Archipelago are very numerous. Many other volcanoes exist either as parts of systems or as isolated examples. Among the latter, two of the most noted are Vesuvius and Etna.† We have already mentioned that the history of the former is perhaps better known than that of any other.

The volcanic region of the Mediterranean was the only one known to the ancient inhabitants of the countries which border on that sea, and they have left us but very imperfect records of the eruptions of the three principal centres of volcanic activity—Naples, Sicily, and the Grecian Archipelago. From the earliest settlement of Southern Italy down to its eruption in the year 79 of our era, Vesuvius had shown no sign, except by its structure, of being an active volcano. On its summit there was a crater, with steep cliffs, its interior being overgrown with wild vines, with a barren plain at the bottom. The flanks of the mountain, however, on the exterior were covered with fertile fields carefully cultivated, the populous cities of Herculaneum and Pompeii being situated at its base. The account of the eruptions in the year 79, which is so often referred to, we need not here repeat. Suffice it to say that the two cities above named were suddenly overwhelmed, and remained buried beneath many feet of lava, ashes and pumice, for more than sixteen centuries, when, in 1713, Herculaneum was accidentally discovered by the sinking of a well, which, fortunately, came upon the ancient theatre.

---

* Lyell's *Principles*, Vol. i. pp. 587–8.

† These are rather centres of volcanic districts.

Many things have been discovered which throw great light on the ancient manners and customs of those cities. Since only a small number of skeletons have been discovered, we conclude that the greater part of the inhabitants escaped. In relation to the streets, we may remark that in some cases the pavements have sunk down, but in the majority they are undisturbed, consisting of irregular flags of lava neatly joined together, and often the carriage wheels have worn in them ruts an inch and a half deep. "It is impossible," says Lyell, "not to look with some interest even on these ruts, which were worn by chariot-wheels more than seventeen centuries ago, and, independently of their antiquity, it is remarkable to see such deep incisions so continuous in a stone of great hardness."

For completeness, the history of the eruption of Etna ranks next to that of Vesuvius. This mountain is a little more than two miles in height above the level of the sea, and rises in solitary grandeur, the monarch of European volcanoes. Over the whole immense declivity of Etna, and more especially the lower region, one beholds innumerable eminences or small conical hills, which rise from its surface, adorned with towns and villages, hamlets and monasteries.

Of the great eruptions of this volcano, we have space to mention only some of the principal ones. In the year 1669 there was an eruption which destroyed numerous towns and villages, some of them containing a population of 3,000 or 4,000 inhabitants, and also a part of the city of Catania. The walls of the city had been purposely raised to protect it and its inhabitants. The flood of burning lava, after reaching the walls, rose higher and higher, till it reached the top of the walls, a height of sixty feet, and then it poured over, forming a fiery cascade of great sublimity, but carrying destruction into the city, which the walls were to protect, and a part of it was overwhelmed. The wall resisted the pressure of the lava, and it was afterwards discovered by excavations made in the rock by the Prince of Biscari.

In 1819, during the eruption which happened in that year, three large caverns opened, and in a short time afterwards a fourth one was formed below, from which flames and smoke issued, and finally a fifth mouth was opened still lower, from which a torrent of lava flowed, spreading itself rapidly over the Val del Bove. On arriving at the precipices known as the Salte della Giumenta, at the head of the valley of Calanna, the lava fell over in a cascade, making a great crash as it reached the bottom. Nine months after the eruption Mr. Scrope visited this lava current, and found it moving slowly down a considerable slope, at the rate of about a yard an hour. Cracks in the lava revealed a dull red light by night, and during the day visible vapor issued in considerable quantity.*

Besides the igneous phenomena to which we have now referred, there are hot springs and geysers, whose influence produce changes, though much less considerable than either volcanoes or earthquakes. The geysers of Iceland have often been described, and their phenomena and general appearance are well known.

Quite recently many geysers were discovered on the Yellowstone and the Firehole river, Wyoming Territory. Hot springs in some places are numerous, some of them even boil, but these are no true geysers. The elevation above the level of the sea is such that water boils at a temperature varying from 192° to 196° Fahr. On the Firehole river the Upper Geyser Basin is found, and at this place the great geysers exist. They are found about ten miles up the river. None of the great geysers exist at the Lower Geyser Basin, but, in the early morning, for four or five hours, it presents a most beautiful appearance—"columns of steam are rising from a thousand vents, completely shrouding the valley as with a dense fog." At the Upper Basin the geyser called "Old Faithful" sends up a column of water every hour, six feet in diameter, to a height of one hundred to one hundred and fifty feet. This region has been set apart by Congress for a National Park.*

---

* Scrope on Volcanoes, first edition, p. 102.

The influence of earthquakes and volcanoes on the surface of the earth we have seen to be very great, when long periods of time are considered; but their immediate effect on man is even greater. So far as man is able to foresee to a certain extent, and prepare for a catastrophe, or counteract its effects somewhat, he is content to live where he is scarcely at any time safe; but when he is absolutely incapable of foreseeing, and in a measure avoiding danger, it seems that nothing but necessity causes him to expose himself and property to it. In the case of volcanoes, those who live in their immediate neighborhood have more or less warning, and they have time to flee from danger in many cases. But with earthquakes it is different. No one living in their vicinity knows whither he can go to place himself beyond the reach of danger; he is as likely to run into it as to run away from it.

Lyell says that why subterranean movements, which in the course of ages prove eminently beneficial, are attended with so much suffering, is beyond our philosophy to determine. In relation to this, we may remark that there is no evidence that this world was made especially for man, as we are sometimes told; but rather man, being the most recently formed of all the animal creation, is adapted, as well as circumstances will permit, to his condition. As for suffering and misfortune, they are powerful incentives to intellectual progress, by stimulating the mind to investigate their causes, and thus to prevent or avoid them as far as possible. Man is certainly more a creature of necessity than many are willing to admit. Calamities and sufferings, in at least nine cases out of ten, are the result of ignorance.

---

* *Silliman's Journal*, Vol. iii., [3], pp. 105–115, 162–176, 294–297.

NOTICES AND CRITICISMS.

EDUCATION.

1. *Guyot's Elementary Geography for Primary Classes.*
2. *Guyot's Intermediate Geography.*
3. *Guyot's Physical Geography. Advanced Sheets.* New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1872.

Upon the first issue of the above series of geographies, we took occasion to point out some of their more glaring defects.* We again take them up in view of the recent additions to the series, and of the extraordinary efforts put forth, not only to effect their introduction into all our schools, but to secure their recommendation as superior to all others. In referring to this series of text-books, it may be necessary to state briefly their peculiar plan, upon which are based the claims of so great superiority. "Previous to the issue of Guyot's Geographies, scarcely any efforts had been made to exhibit in a series of text-books the connection between the *Geography of Nature* and that of *Man*," the italics being the writer's. This writer, we are informed by the author, is a lady of remarkable success in teaching geography, whose assistance in the preparation of these books he was "very providentially" enabled to secure. We may hence infer that in this series we are "providentially," to have the "geography of man," whatever that may be. The obvious derivation of the term *geography* from *γῆ*, the earth, and *γραφη*, a description, renders this language still more enigmatical; but we pass on to notice another "characteristic of these geographies as distinguished from other series." "They recognize the element of successive *causation* connecting the different geographical topics, and make it the basis of the order in which those topics are treated." That is, the physical features of the earth and the distribution of races upon its surface, the relation of the climate, soil, etc., to the productions and degree of civilization, and the mutual influence of those complex causes are the link which is to bind together the disjointed topics of these text-books in the minds of young pupils; thus calling for the exercise of the faculties, analysis and deduction, which can only be developed in the most advanced stages of education. This is the actual course pursued, in contrast with that laid down in the teacher's "Manual," in which sixty pages are employed to explain to and instruct the teachers how to use these geographies! There the order is given, as, first, to employ the powers of observation; second, of retention, and third, of imagination (p. 7). That this is *not* the order adopted is seen in a glance at the "Elementary," where at the same time the attempt is made to show this philosophical connection, and in language certainly better adapted to the nursery than to the schoolroom.

Thus, under the head of occupations, which are introduced at once on this theory of "successive causation," the pupil is informed (p. 15) that "catching fish from the water is called fishing." In answer to the question "How do people on the banks of rivers spend their time?" we read "the people in these places are most of them very busy *with* mills and factories, making *all kinds of things.*" (!) In the "Intermediate," where more precision of language might be expected, among the first definitions we meet, is the following. "By the climate of a country is meant heat or cold, moisture or dryness, *healthfulness* or *unhealthfulness,*" on which it is unneccessary to comment.

In regard to the "native people" of South America we read (p. 23) "Negroes are numerous *among the white inhabitants,*" and on the next page, "Cayenne pepper is a native of Guiana," whether classed among the white inhabitants or negroes we are not informed!

These extracts will be sufficient to illustrate the language employed to teach clearly this theory of "successive causation" or "natural order" by which the pupil is to obtain an "intelligent knowledge" of the subject. Indeed this attempt to teach the philosophy of geography in this infantile style of language would be simply ludicrous, were it not for the fact that these books are in the hands of hundreds of children. We read on one page, the author's preface, in which he enlarges upon this principle of causative connection between the earth's surface and man's history as the only true method of studying geography, and on the next page, that of the "remarkably successful teacher," announcing that "minuteness of observation is the distinctive method of this book." (!) By this assistance the author congratulates himself that "the difficulty in presenting the subject in language appropriate for children is providentially obviated;" but the poor children, we apprehend, will not have much cause for thankfulness in the success of this attempt at the amalgamation of these opposite systems of instruction. In this teacher's "suggestions to teachers" she says: "We begin by directing attention to that which is under the eye of the pupil; we show him how to *interrogate* the region of country in the midst of which he lives." The first thing that the pupil finds to "interrogate" is a picture, which at once readily recalls that of Hogarth representing "false perspective."

The author seems to have suspected this, for in the annexed lesson the pupil is informed that "*horses* are drawing a *wagon* over *the ground*," and that "*ships* and boats are sailing on *the water*," which in this case seems to be needed information, as to all appearances the horses are walking *into* the water, and the ships sailing *over* the houses! After the pupil has sufficiently exercised his "powers of observation" upon the view he is told that it is "a picture of the land and water." This false perspective is even more noticeable in a view called "New York wharves, foot of Canal street," where land, water, and sky, houses, boats, and men, are all in indescribable confusion. Indeed all the cuts are extremely rude, and in their style and execution carry us back to the primitive days of the typographic art. Nor can much better be said of the maps, especially of that of the world on Mercator's projection, which greatly enlarges the comparative size of the polar regions; but that is regarded as of "little consequence." Upon this map we notice what at first appears to be a shower of blots, but which we learn are intended to represent islands. By the time the pupil has been able to discriminate the islands from the blots, we have no doubt that his faculties of observation will be sufficiently exercised!

The coloring of the maps is intended to represent the relative heights above the sea level, but, as the standard is not uniform, it fails entirely to give any idea of the *actual* elevations. The claim that the coloring in any manner *pictures* to the mind the respective elevations is entirely without foundation, while we are convinced that to the young pupil it is only an embarrassment, and to the older student very inadequate for the purpose.

The "constructive system of map drawing" is claimed as the chief and crowning excellence of this series. We should like to transcribe for our readers the directions for drawing the map of South America, which, as it is considered the simplest, is given first. Quite a complete set of drafting instruments, as well as a knowledge of some of the problems of geometry, are necessary in order to carry out these instructions. "Thus the pupil is to lay off the line *m* as a basis of measurement, to make B very nearly two *m*, C one and one-half *m*; a little (not quite one-fifth *m*) above its end we find," etc. When we reflect that this map is the least complex, that the others employ all the known and unknown geometrical figures, that the standard of measurement is different for each map, and that the directions in each case are arbitrary, without system or connection with each other, it is easy to judge of the merits of this plan as adapted to the capacities of young pupils, or compared with either the triangular or rectangular system.

The last merit we shall notice that is claimed for these books is, that they give great exercise to the imagination. This claim we are disposed to allow; for certainly most of the facts which one might expect to find in a work of this kind, intended for young pupils who acquire nearly all their geographical knowledge in a short period at school, are left entirely to be imagined. Among these important omissions are the counties and corresponding divisions of states and countries, an account of the government, religion, degree of civilization, population, and political power of the several countries of which no hint is given except in a few pages of the *Teacher's edition.* As an example of the manner in which the giving of the most natural information seems to be studiously avoided, and of the general looseness of expression, we give one more extract of the kind, in which the work abounds: "Brooklyn, *on Long Island*, is next to New York in size," but nothing is said as to whether it is one mile or a hundred from that city. "Philadelphia is situated on Delaware river not far from Delaware Bay. *This* is a great manufacturing city" (p. 34).

With these extracts we leave the reader to judge whether the exertions put forth to secure the endorsement of these books and their introduction into all our schools is justified by their merits. We take no pleasure in alluding to these facts, but since our attention has been so frequently called to them, it becomes our duty to do so. The giving away of text-books to teachers and others interested in making changes, may be merely an evidence of the remarkable generosity of the publishers, but it smacks rather too strongly of undue influence in introducing books which are unable to introduce themselves. If these educators are thus favored, what shall we say of those to whom copies, not only of these text-books, but of other and more valuable works, are presented in order to secure their recommendation? But, under the law of compensations, they too experience the disadvantages of being prominent men, if constant importunity in public and in private, lengthy interviews, and even the dogging of their steps in order to secure the endorsement which they cannot conscientiously give, may be considered a drawback to their position. Certain publishers, like the Greeks, are to be suspected most when conferring gifts. Not that we would imply that it is culpable in a business point of view for a man to invite examination and praise of his wares if they deserve it; but making undue, not to say improper efforts, to secure recommendation, is of itself *prima facie* evidence of a lack of genuine excellence in the article thus sought to be puffed. When publishers of text-books designed for the instruction of our children employ all the arts of quack-medicine venders, in order to promote the sale of their works, criticism is plainly called for. But when the educational wares thus sought to be praised and puffed are in reality much inferior to those already in the market, it becomes a duty to discriminate, and point out the defects of the one as well as the excellences of the other.

This we owe not only to the cause of education, but to prominent educators who have been "interviewed" by enterprising publishers to such a degree that we have frequently been requested to expose their annoying proceedings. As an illustration of this annoyance to which our influential men are daily subject, we will refer to a case fully known to ourselves. A well-known educator who has control over several literary institutions, having frequently declined with thanks the generous offers of certain publishers to substitute their books for others much superior, they at length bring up their great gun and demand an "unconditional surrender." This was a no less personage than a high functionary of our Board of Education, and being of the same religious belief as the gentleman who was the object of attack, this combination was deemed irresistible. Yet, strange as it may appear, the assailed party was able to resist this combined assault, and even to intimate to the above-mentioned functionary that perhaps the Board of Education had as much claim upon his services as the liberal publishers in whose interests he was so active. Acting on this hint, they retired in good order, but have not since been heard from in that quarter.

Here, for the present, we will take leave of the subject, only referring to the physical geography to say that in it the amalgamation attempt is abandoned, and to that extent, at least, it is a better text-book than the others of the series. When we have an opportunity to examine it entire we will take pleasure in commending it if it seems to us to deserve it; for we certainly do not infer because certain publications of a house are open to criticism that all partake of that character.

Zell's Descriptive Hand-Atlas of the World. By J. BARTHOLOMEW, Geographer. 4to. Philadelphia: T. Ellwood Zell. 1871-73.

WHEN the publication of the present work was begun, the publishers announced "an Atlas on a new plan." The need of such a work has long been evident to those who have noticed the rapid extension of our intercourse with distant portions of the globe, as seen in our new relations with China and Japan, and the frequency with which we meet the Mongolian type of features upon our streets. "*Scientia est Potentia*" is the motto of the publishers; Knowledge is Power—not possessed by an exclusive guild over the unenlightened multitude, but diffused, scattered broadcast, and placed within the reach of every man. To aid in rendering the knowledge of our globe more available, and hence more valuable, is the object of this new Atlas. An acquaintance with geography is no longer an accomplishment; it is a necessity, felt each day more and more by every man who transacts business or even reads a newspaper.

There are, it is true, excellent geographies in use, such, for example, as Mitchell's, especially adapted to the use of the pupil; nor would we be understood as saying one word derogatory to its merits. That now under consideration is eminently the business man's Atlas, yet it does not fail to meet the requirements of the student. For the information of the latter are given the direction and course of each of the oceanic currents, with a description of their causes and effects, isothermal lines, limits of ice and of human habitation, and the distribution of races and religions, with accompanying statistics. For the former are given the air-line distance of the capital of each country from New York, the ocean steamer and sailing-vessel routes, distinctly traced to and from the chief American and British ports, with the distance and time in days, the limits of commercial intercourse, and all the principal telegraph lines laid and projected by land and sea, with the distances.

This will indicate the comprehensive character of the work, yet it is designed for popular use and brought within the reach of all. It is published in twenty-five parts, containing thirty-five maps, one being issued each month, and of which twenty-two numbers are now before us. The maps are models of good coloring and clear printing This may be seen by reference to the map of England and Wales, for instance, upon which are upwards of two thousand names of towns, rivers, mountains, etc.; yet there is no confusion or indistinctness.

The approximate population of each city and town is seen by the size and kind of type employed, thus dispensing in many cases with reference to the tables, in which are given, in addition to the population, the county or district in which the village or city is situated, and an alphabetical index for reference to the map. The value of this index will be appreciated by every man of business habits, as soon as he perceives the vast saving of time otherwise lost in searching the map. This is effected by the lettering upon the top and side of each map, and the squares formed by the meridians and parallels of latitude. By reference to the proper square the desired place is found at once. This we have ourselves had occasion to prove, and can testify to the advantage of the plan over those we had previously seen.

The map of the world in No. 1 is on Sir J. Herschel's projection, thus repeating parts of Asia and North America, and the whole of the Pacific Ocean. By this means ocean routes, currents, etc., may be traced in their full extent without losing the connection. The longitude upon all the maps is reckoned from the same meridian, that of Greenwich, thus securing uniformity in the estimate of distances and the relative positions of countries and cities. The parallels of latitude are also mentioned which correspond in one hemisphere to those in another. Thus, of the New England States we read that they correspond in latitude in the eastern hemisphere to France, the north of Spain and Italy, and to the Isle of Yesso, in Japan. The difference in climate of these places has often been noticed. Thus, also, we know that London is a little north of parallel 57° north latitude, which corresponds upon this continent to the frozen regions of Labrador. These great climatic differences are now known to be due chiefly to those vast oceanic and aerial currents whose silent flow produces such grand results.

The map of England and its scale, 29 miles to the inch, are taken as the standard of comparison with all the other maps, thus conveying a correct idea not only of the absolute but the relative extent of each country or continent. The maps are all of the same size, so that by a simple reference to the scale of miles it is easy to compute, in a moment, the comparative areas of any two countries. This is decidedly a distinguishing excellence of the new Atlas. As an instance of this comparative method of statement we quote that in reference to South America:

"The area, of which about three-fourths are within the tropics, is estimated at above 7,000,000 square miles, equal to one and eight-tenths of Europe, one-fifth less

than North America, and to more than one-seventh of the entire land surface of the globe. Population about 27,086,000, showing an average density of less than four persons per square mile; it is thus the most thinly peopled of the continents. The scale of the map is 298 miles to an inch, one square inch comprising 105 times the area represented by one square inch of map of England."

The comparative densities of population furnish material for interesting study and important deductions. Thus we see them ranging from about 100 per square mile in Scotland, 344 in England, 425 in Belgium, to 854 in the province of Kiang-su, China, and down to 4 in South America. These facts point, like the finger of Destiny, to the fertile soil and virgin forests of South America as the reserved retreat for earth's teeming peoples, and as the future seat of a mighty empire, where now rolls the Amazon, "and hears no sound save his own dashings." While referring to this subject we note an oversight of the editor's, or perhaps of the printer's, by which it is affirmed that only one State in the Union, viz., Rhode Island, has a greater density of population than Scotland. The density of population in Rhode Island is given as 166.4 per square mile, while Massachusetts has 186.8, thus giving the precedence in this respect to the Bay State.

The amount of valuable information condensed in the accompanying text is certainly noteworthy, and can be fully appreciated only by long and daily use of the Atlas. It is of almost every variety which can be useful to the numerous classes of men. In addition to the facts of physical geography, such as length of rivers, heights of mountains and other elevations of land, insothermals, surface, climate, etc., there are included the direction and length of ocean and telegraph lines, and other routes of communication, the percentage of increase or decrease of population of States since 1860, the number of counties, of representatives in Congress, and in the two houses of the State legislature, etc. We also notice the names of countries given in different languages, as Germany, *Deutschland*, *Allemagne*, *Germania;* also the ancient and modern names, as in Palestine, the city Rabba, ancient *Areopolis*. This, taken in connection with the locations of ruins of cities, ancient territories, tribes, etc., enables the biblical student to find all he seeks upon the map of Palestine, while that of Italy and Greece answers every purpose of a classical atlas. Further needful information is thrown into a brief note in respect to the signification of foreign terms. Thus we notice in the Arabic, *Ard*, plain; *Jebel*, mountain; and in the Chinese, *Ho* and *Kiang*, river, etc. We are aware that the publishers have been at much expense in the preparation of this work, and have intended to make it preëminent in its class, and in this they have clearly succeeded. We have not, however, called attention to all its excellences, many of them new, others not; but we are of opinion that in no other work of the kind can be found so many combined; which, with its facility of reference and accuracy of statement, will render it of great utility and value to all classes of people.

Oxford's Junior Speaker: a Collection of Exercises, Recitations and Representations. Adapted to the Young of Both Sexes. By William Oxford. 12mo, pp. 216. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co., 1872.

Among all the excellent educational works which have issued from the press of the publishers of this volume, we know of none better adapted to its sphere than this juvenile speaker. In no direction has more improvement been made of late than in works for the young. Nor was there greater need of it in any class of text-books. The period is past in which hasty abbreviations of standard speeches on the one hand, or nursery rhymes on the other, are considered all sufficient to instruct the youthful generation in the art of oratory. Works of this class, in order to meet the necessities of the hour, must not only contain abundant selections suitable for early elocutionary drill, but they must also be adapted to the tastes of youth, and at the same time be of a character which will leave no impression upon the youthful mind which later years might wish to erase.

The neat volume before us goes far toward fulfilling these requirements. This is especially noticeable in the selections which constitute the elocutionary exercises. These are classified into "political and martial speeches in prose," "dialogues and concerted pieces in prose and verse," "serious pieces in verse," and "light and humorous pieces in verse," comprising in all nearly two hundred articles. Their brevity and the skill with which a long story is condensed into few words renders them peculiarly adapted to the use of young learners, and for public school entertainments. While there are many brief, stirring and instructive selections from the great orators, few of them are of that stereotyped class which we find in nearly every work of the kind. Indeed, it is remarkable that compilers of these works have so long confined themselves to those familiar selections, when it is well known that the writings of the great speakers abound in material equally eloquent and suitable for the purpose. The compiler of this work has drawn largely from these original sources, as well as from others not so famous, yet generally well suited for a work of this kind. This adaptation is shown in the subjects of the dialogues, consisting largely in the portrayal of scenes, feelings and incidents peculiar to the school-room and playground.

These exercises in representation are, many of them, dramatized from narratives in a very skilful manner, which brings out the point and illustrates the moral to a degree proportionate to the advantage which the dramatic possesses over the narrative form in this respect. Thus the old story of young Franklin and the axe-grinder is arranged in dramatic form, which vividly conveys the lesson taught by the old cynic to the young philosopher. We will remark, in passing, that it is also eminently suggestive of the course of many compilers of juvenile books, who thus seek to give point to their dull literary axes. These dialogues are also mostly so arranged as to be adapted to representation by both sexes, thus supplying a need long felt by many teachers.

While the spirit and terseness of these selections are such as to excite the interest of the pupil, the language employed is a happy mean between stilted verboseness on the one hand and ungrammatical simplicity on the other. Many of the selections possess a kind of humor peculiarly amusing to the young, yet, almost without exception, are of a moral tone and character, to which no parent could object and at the same time generally convey a useful lesson. The rules for elocutionary practice are brief, practical, and well suited to the capacity of the pupils, while throughout the work words to be emphasized are marked in italics, and those of difficult pronunciation divided and accented. The illustrations are mostly explanatory in design, neat in execution, and ornamental in appearance. Although there are a few selections perhaps too infantile for a "Junior Speaker," and others which might be omitted without loss, on the whole it is one which we most cheerfully commend to parents and teachers.

Reviews and Essays on Art, Literature, and Science. By ALMIRA LINCOLN PHELPS, author of "Lincoln's Botanies," "Phelps' Chemistries and Natural Philosophies," etc. 12mo, pp. 321. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelinger. 1873.

LOOKING back upon a long life spent in educational and literary labor, the author of the present volume has collected such of its results as seem to possess the most permanent and general value, and presented them to the public as, perhaps, the last production of her pen. Like her sister, Mrs. Willard, the founder of a very respectable literary institution, and author of various standard text-books, essays, etc., and connected with the chief literary, social, and scientific movements of her times, her writings cannot fail to interest her contemporaries and to prove valuable to the younger generation.

Such we find to be the contents of the present volume. It is our purpose at this time merely to indicate their general scope and character. First we have a "Glance at the Fine Arts," in which the author commenting upon the causes of the neglect and lack of appreciation of the fine arts in America, proceeds to give a brief history of arts and artists of the several schools, pointing out the leading spirits and distinguishing characteristics of each. These she seizes upon with the intuition of one capable of appreciating the true end and aim of art. Although not wanting in a high estimation of the value of art, *per se*, the author regards it in an ethical point of view, in its influence upon or as an expression of the moral character of a people.

In "England under the Stuarts," we have a graphic condensation of the history of the mother-country in that thrilling and eventful period. Based upon the conflicting views of Hume and Hallam, her unbiased judgment strikes the happy mean, and her analytical mind presents in few words the salient points of events and character, while womanly sympathy is evinced towards the unhappy Mary and the ill-fated Charles, and in condemnation of cruelty and injustice everywhere. In "Social Life in America," she points out the truth as well as error in the strictures of Dickens, Miss Martineau, and other writers upon our society, evincing a knowledge of the weakness and wants of American character as well as its strength and stability.

In "Madame de Maintenon and her Times," we see a vivid and in general truthful picture of French character and customs in the luxurious court of Louis XIV.; and the much-slandered Maintenon evidently receives ample justice. "The De Saussures and their Writings" is an interesting and appreciative essay upon that eminent family. That upon the "Life and Writings of Goethe," while giving an appreciative estimate of the works of the great poet, shows that the writer's sense of rectitude is not blinded to the moral imperfections of the man. A very just comparison is drawn between a portion of "Faust" and its prototype the "Book of Job," showing how far the modern falls below the ancient poet in his conception of the character of Deity. The essay upon the character and writings of Mrs. Sigourney is a well-deserved tribute to that excellent lady, and deems her poem of Pocahontas alone sufficient to yield her enduring fame. The chapters upon "Popular Botany" and "Popular Science" embody the author's views upon these subjects, to which she has given forty years of her life as an investigator and instructor.

"The Union of Religion and Science," as exemplified in the life and writings of the late Dr. Edward Hitchcock, is an essay read before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at Buffalo, in 1866. The paper upon "Circulation by Respiration" is a history of this theory, and defence of Mrs. Willard, as its originator. It is an impartial account of the difficulties and discouragements experienced by that talented lady in her efforts to obtain recognition in scientific circles, not for herself, but for the theory. Its gradual advance and final triumph are illustrated in the following interesting narration:

> "Dr. Ely was one who had opposed and written against the theory. In the meantime, his infant son had cholera and expired. His medical friends had left him, and crape was tied to the front door. Standing by the side of his lifeless babe, Dr. Ely said to himself, 'If this theory should be true, I might yet save my child,' and, profiting by the example of Dr. Cortwright in restoring the dead alligator, he restored his son to life. Remitting his efforts too soon, again the infant ceased to breathe. And again, and yet the third time the father restored him, when the resuscitaton proved complete, and months afterwards the child was living and in perfect health. Dr. Ely then came promptly forward, and, like a noble, honest man, reported the case as convincing evidence of a truth which he had formerly opposed."

The article is an able argument in favor of the claim of an American lady to be ranked as a discoverer in physiology, and, as a tribute to her memory, fitly completes the volume. These reviews, while not claiming to be profoundly critical, yet convey, in a condensed and lucid style, much information, and generally correct impressions of the subjects treated. The *tout ensemble* forms a very readable collection of essays upon important subjects, and, to the author's wide circle of friends and pupils, a valuable "sheaf of gleanings from the harvests" of a remarkably useful life.

---

1. *On the Mountain; or, Lost and Found.* By LUCY ELLEN GUERNSEY. 16mo, pp. 228.
2. *How the Kingdom Came to Little Joy.* 16mo, pp. 196. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union.

IN view of the great number of third-rate sensational novels which at the present day are to be found in our Sunday-school libraries, it affords us sincere pleasure to call attention to books that are unexceptionable in character, as well as interesting and instructive in matter. It is a deplorable fact that in collections designed for the young, and especially in those nominally intended for religious instruction, works of pure moral sentiment are the exception. We are aware that this tendency towards sensational reading is a reaction from the dull, unnatural, morbidly pious class of books which have so largely predominated in these libraries. To strike the happy mean, to give the story sufficient reality and interest to render it attractive enough to compete with the dime novel class of books and at the same time convey useful and salutary moral instruction, is no easy task.

These requirements are, however, well met in the books before us, and the Sunday-school Union is doing a good work in providing this class of reading-matter for those who need it. These handsome volumes are designed to teach the necessary lessons of self-sacrifice and faith; which is done through the medium of simple narratives natural in their events, truthful in description, and interesting to the young reader.

The management of the conversation seems to be the most difficult part of the task to both the writers. The grammatical precision and appropriateness of language are a little too remarkable in these untaught children, and the words of wisdom which fall from their lips would imply at least unusual precocity in the youthful subjects. This is more noticeable in the narrative "On the Mountain," though the course of events and feelings manifested are in general very natural.

The principal character is a spoiled child, Fanny, who falls into the hands of a kind, yet wise and firm grandmother, by whose discipline and her own misfortunes she is at length taugth the great lesson of self-control and self-sacrifice. The "new-fashioned theories" of family government are hit off in the person of Mrs. Lilly, Fanny's mother. The author thus refers to them:

> "Mrs. Lilly, the younger, had some new-fashioned theories on the bringing-up of children. She thought they should never be punished, for fear of making them slaves; nor restrained from saying all they pleased, lest they should become sly; nor checked in eating, drinking, or play, for fear they should think too much of these things; nor taught anything they did not wish to learn, lest their brains should be overtaxed or they should take a dislike to learning."

These theories, we fear, are entertained by more than one parent and with similar results. The other characters in the story are Sarah Weyman, an untaught country girl, whose strength of character and rough sincerity are in strong contrast to Fanny's arts and duplicity; Willy, an honest farmer's boy; an Indian servant, Oney; Steeprock, an old Indian hunter, who, with his dog, succeeds in finding little Annie, who was lost upon the mountain through Fanny's negligence and falsehood, and rescued alive through the heroic self-sacrifice of Sarah Leyman. Sarah becomes an invalid in consequence of her exposure, but finally recovers and finds "her sphere" as a nurse. Fanny reforms, and all ends well.

Little Joy, the heroine of the other narrative, a lame, untaught, simple child, having heard the story of the Pilgrim's Progress, sets off in search of the "Zion-land," becomes mired in a meadow not far from her home, is rescued by a farmer's boy whom she styles Mr. Hope, cared for by a kind old lady, and taught that the "kingdom of Heaven is within." She returns home and induces her older brother, Darry, to seek the same, who, shortly after, reaches the kingdom through the watery gates of death by drowning, and little Joy goes to the poor-house. On a visit to her brother's grave, to see if the angels had taken him away, she meets a bereaved man, Mr. Gordon, who gives her further instructions on the subject, and invites her to a Thanksgiving dinner with her little blind friend, Joey, where they spend a happy afternoon, and return to the workhouse and the realities of life. The story borders upon the solemn, and has a tinge of the unreal, yet is generally conducted so as to be interesting and to illustrate the lesson of child-like faith. We can only add that it is greatly to be desired that all Sunday-school books should be as unexceptionable as these, and as well adapted to the tastes and needs of youth.

Autology: a System of Mental Science. A Vindication of the Manhood of Man, the Godhead of God, and the Divine Authorship of Nature. By Rev. D. H. HAMILTON, D. D. 8vo, 700 pp. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1873.

THE title of this work will doubtless be new to most of our readers, as the author has coined a word to express an idea peculiarly his own. By this term we are to understand a treatise on man, on self-knowing. Making man the starting-point of inquiry, the author proceeds to discuss directly the nature of God, and indirectly that of the external world, and of brutes and angels. It will thus be seen that the scope of the work is certainly comprehensive, for it includes the consideration of both material and spiritual worlds. It cannot be without interest, for it offers an explanation of all the controverted metaphysical and theological questions which have ever arisen. From the vast regions of what has been considered unknowable, he has rescued many a wandering truth, and assigned it a place among those generally accepted. With the earnest conviction of a sincere believer in his own theory, wrought out in his vigorous mind by years of profound study, the author assumes to lay many of these debated points forever at rest, and over them write *requiescat in pace.*

The object of the work is, as he informs us, not to write a book, but to decide the question, "God or no God; theism or atheism." This battle is to be fought out "not over a reptile or a force, not over a cell or a protoplasm, but over man." *γνῶϑι σεαυτὸν* is emphatically his text. The aim of the work is not merely to advance some new idea upon metaphysical science, but to construct and explain an entirely new and original system. If adopted, it will be in many respects a revolution in this department of inquiry, and establish beyond doubt certain theories now agitated by theologians and scientists. The entire system is cohesive and consistent with itself; so is the terminology employed. Although many of the words are used by the author in a new sense, we have no cause for objection, when they are employed in the same sense throughout, which is the case. He claims for himself this privilege, as one who forges new thoughts must be allowed to construct his own vehicle in which to convey them. The whole construction of the system proceeds logically from the foundation, and unless we can destroy this we must accept the edifice entire. As this foundation is laid in the consciousness of man, and as its testimony is conclusive to every one, each can judge for himself of the reality of the superstructure built thereon.

The order of inquiry adopted is man, God, nature—a reversion of that previously pursued by all the philosophers, metaphysical and physical, from Aristotle to Agassiz; for the existence of a God from that of nature, or, as it is commonly called, the argument from design, is in this system cast aside as entirely futile. "Through nature up to nature's God" the author claims can never conduct man to his Creator. He says, "Nature is the lone Isis, who ever still, as of old, inscribes on her own eternal mechanism as descriptive of herself, her history and her doom: 'I am all that has been, I am all that shall be, and none among mortals has ever been able to lift my veil.'"

The theory is propounded that man can know God *directly*, or by a direct induction from his self-knowledge, and thus is avoided the circle of arguments and misconceptions which have so long attended the subject. Where man can know himself and God, the position of nature and her relation to both is easily comprehended. In this work the mind is divided into essential intelligence and essential activity, which are regarded as existing simultaneously in its constitution. Thus the old question of the origin of ideas is avoided, or rather it does not arise. Then are considered in order the will, affections, intellect, and conscience, all forming together the personality or "manhood" of man. In reply to the first point of inquiry, "How can the mind begin to act?" the author endeavors to show that as its source of action cannot be in the senses or in the reason, "the true source of the mind's activity is in its own essence." A similar answer is given to the question, "How can the mind begin to know?" "All knowing of external things consists in the interpreting of a fact by an idea." (p. 21.) This theory is thus expanded:

"If I start with the fact and seek the idea, I have already had and used the idea in finding the fact. If I start with the idea and seek the fact, I find I have already had and used the fact in obtaining the idea. . . . There must first exist

both a fact and an idea before any external thing can be known. . . . It is manifest, therefore, that neither the senses alone nor the reason alone can ever begin to know anything. . . . A higher and more ultimate faculty than either is necessary. . . . . Such a faculty we have in a rightly understood consciousness. . . . Essential intelligence or consciousness, and essential activity or life, are the true sources of the mind's knowing and acting." (pp. 23, 25.)

We have thus indicated the line of argument pursued in relation to the first points of inquiry, that it may be seen upon what basis the system rests. In the following words we have the whole scope and plan of this "Autology:" "Man is to himself the first great object of knowledge, and this knowledge of himself is to him the key to all knowledge of God and nature." The work is devoted to the substantiating of this thesis, and its application to the problems to which it gives rise. Thus on "Will and Liberty" we note that Dr. Hamilton makes Will and Self identical; that all the faculties of the mind constituting personality inhere in the will; that its action binds over the whole man to responsibility, "though the reason may object and the conscience protest," and that liberty is a constituent element of the will. On the question "Why does the will choose one thing rather another?" he remarks that it could arise only from confounding choosing with selecting, and then adds, "To choose a thing because it presents the strongest motive would in no way affect the liberty of the will, for it does not depend on that. The act of the will is free, whether it has an alternative object of choice or not." Then, having laid at rest what he calls this "perturbed spirit which bewilders with its *ignis fatuus* light," he writes: "Let it never be let loose again to vex the brain of theologians or metaphysicians, feeble or strong." The question, "Can any power control the will inevitably without destroying its liberty?" he answers in the affirmative by the illustration of a jury trial, with the law, right, argument, etc., all on one side, and that thus God can inevitably persuade any soul to repentance if he chooses. The query which comes hard after this explanation, "Why then does God not choose to do so?" the author does not seem to have deemed worthy of consideration.

On the subject of "total depravity," the philosopher takes the orthodox view as to its generality, if not totality. This view, we are obliged to confess, finds sanction in the light of recent developments in our public affairs. Yet we are not among those who, for one misstep, are ready to condemn a man's whole character, or to conclude thence that he must be "totally depraved."

The author's division of objects will not, we think, meet with general acceptance. "All being in the universe," says Dr. Hamilton, "is made up of spirit, life, and force. Human nature has in it all three; brutes have life and force, while inanimate nature has only force." (p. 323.) This division, to be scientific, requires a definition of its terms, particularly of life, which we do not find that he has anywhere given. The whole subject of brute life appears to us to be disposed of somewhat summarily, considering our limited actual knowledge of it. As long as the author confines himself to man ,we can test every step by our own consciousness, but when we advance to the consideration of the lower orders of animals, our knowledge at best is only inference.

We have space only to indicate a few of the questions treated in this able work. The subjects of time and space are discussed in a manner similar to that of Kant, yet the author regards them as creations rather than necessary conceptions, and insists strongly upon the distinction between space and nothingness. He says, "Created space and time are simply the containers of created objects and events, and live and die with them." (p. 391.) Here again he differs from a a large class of philosophers, including Locke and his critic Cousin, in placing this limitation upon the existence of these objects, or, as the Kantian school call them, ideas.

Various other theories of recent as well as ancient interest are freely and fearlessly discussed; such as "The standard of truth," "the limits of knowledge," "miracles," "predestination," "special Providence," and "efficacy of prayer." Thus he does not hesitate to discuss questions as old as those which Milton informs us were topics of conversation among the fallen spirits in Tartarus, nor those as recent as the visit of Prof. Tyndall. The plan of the work also includes a critical review of all the philosophers from Thales to Herbert Spencer, but it having already expanded beyond the prescribed limits, we are promised this in another volume.

The arrangement and classification of the materials are eminently analytical, perhaps too much so for the use of the student, while the business man, for whom also the work is intended, will, we fear, find little leisure for perusal of its 700 pages. But the thinker and all given to research in the vast field of metaphysical speculation, will find in it much to repay their investigation, and lead to deeper and in many instances more accurate comprehension of the great truths which underlie our earthly existence.

The Birds of New England and Adjacent States: with Illustrations of many Species of the Birds and accurate Figures of their Eggs. By Edward A. Samuels, Curator of Zoology in the Massachusetts State Cabinet. 8vo, pp. 590. Boston: Noyes, Holmes & Co. 1872.

In the broad field of nature there is no province of investigation of more interest to man than that of zoology, and of this, doubtless the most agreeable department is that of ornithology. Nothing is better calculated to withdraw the mind from the vexations of business, the disappointments of ambition, and the cares of life than intercourse with nature. Not only is the tendency of this converse seen in its refining influence upon the character of those who seek it, raising them out of the grooves of daily occupation into the broad plain of philosophy and charity, but it has been the recreation and delight of great minds in all ages. This is true not only of those distinguished in physical research, but equally of those most eminent in philosophy and literature.

At the present day, even in the engrossing occupations of American life, we know of scarcely a name of one distinguished in literature or art who is not also a lover of natural history. Yet we could wish that the study of ornithology were more general. Especially would we recommend the present volume to the attention of pupils of both sexes, but particularly to ladies. We are convinced that much of the time now frittered away in the unedifying occupations of many of our literary institutions might be more profitably as well as pleasantly employed in this study, and that many ladies in society would find it a very agreeable relief from the pursuit of fashion and the routine of pleasures.

Although the highest amount of pleasure as well as instruction is to be found in the fields and forests in the company of the feathered tribes, yet a work upon the subject, not too extensive for popular use, yet accurate in its classifications and descriptions, is of much assistance. Such we find to be the work of Mr. Matthews on the Birds of New England. While this comprises but a limited portion of the country, numerous species and varieties of birds are found there, including many of rare beauty of plumage and power of song, as the humming-bird and the mocking-bird.

The classification adopted, partly from Keyserling and Blasius, proceeds mainly upon the arrangements of the toes and mandibles as adapted to seizing prey, wading, swimming, etc. Thus one basis of classification is the hind-toe on the same level as the rest, including the birds of prey, such as the eagle, hawk, and owl, which also have the upper mandible compressed, its point curving down over that of the lower, forming a strong, sharp hook. Upon the same basis another class is formed of those which have the hind-toe raised above the level of the rest, including the waders and swimmers.

First, we have a synopsis of the characteristics of the several orders; then, as they occur, a description of the suborders and families, with both the Latin and common names. In more prominent type are given a history of their habits, times of arrival and departure, their distribution, food, song time of breeding, and a careful and accurate description of their nests and eggs. Upon the latter evidently much care has been bestowed both in giving accurate measurements and figures. Of the illustrations in general we can only say that, although sufficiently numerous, they are by no means in the highest style of the art, nor superior in execution, still not such as to be a blemish in the work. They are mainly copies from other works of the kind, but this is entirely consistent with the plan of the author, which is not so much to convey new information as to collect what is known of the feathered visitors of these latitudes, and to present it in a popularly attractive and instructive form. On the whole, this is well carried out, so that those even who possess considerable information upon the subject will find much pleasure in the perusal of the work.

APPENDIX—INSURANCE, GOOD, BAD, AND INDIFFERENT.

1. *Annual Statements of numerous Life Insurance Companies, New York, Boston, Hartford, Philadelphia, etc.*, 1873.
2. *Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Directors of the New England Mutual Life Insurance Company to the Members. Boston, January*, 1873.
3. *The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company. Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the President to the Board of Directors, January*, 1873.

We have now before us quite an extensive pile of documents. In this are represented all kinds of Insurance from the very best to the the very worst. The bad still largely predominate in point of numbers, although gradually yielding to the law of gravitation. It was a favorite simile with Addison, that all false pretences, like flowers, soon fall to the ground; and never was that simile more forcibly illustrated than it has been within the last two years by insurance companies. This we will show as we proceed. But we may remark in the meantime that no catastrophes have occurred which might not have been expected. Not one company has either given up the ghost altogether, or fallen into hopeless consumption whose prognosis we had not given in these pages during the first stage of its malady—long before its symptoms had become alarming to those who had most to lose by its demise. Far, then, from wondering that so many companies have either passed out of existence altogether, or, on the Hindoo principle of the metempsychosis, passed into other kindred or congenial bodies, we are rather surprised that so many of the same class still linger. This, however, does not, we trust, compromise our skill as a therapeutist, since there are few who are not aware of the astonishing tenacity of life manifested by some consumptives after their case has again and again been declared hopeless. Nay, is it not true that there are many instances in which, not only have all the alarming symptoms subsided or disappeared altogether, but the patients have increased instead of diminishing in weight, and yet the malady has done its fatal work!

Because much mischief often results from the false hopes thus excited, the honest physician warns the friends of the patient—especially those depending more or less on his efforts—although quite aware that, in general, the task is at best a thankless one. The patient himself is too apt to regard him as a bird of evil omen, or as an evil genius taking a malignant pleasure in predicting the fatal issue even when it is rapidly approaching. Our readers know whether we have had any prejudice of this kind to contend against. If they do not, we respectfully refer them to the ghosts of companies like the Great Western Mutual, the Mutual Protection, the Excelsior, the Craftsmen's, the Reserve Mutual, the National Capital, the Empire Mutual, the Anchor, the Hope, etc., etc.

It is true that even the believers in the transmigration of souls deny that all souls transmigrate. The Brahmins maintain that feeble or half-formed souls do not, or, if they do, that they become extinguished very soon after the transmigration has taken place. "Thus," says one of their learned books, "suppose a half-formed soul gets into the carcass of a donkey having the spavin or the rickets, the quadruped may bray two or three times more lustily than he did before; in a similar contingency a lame goose may cackle more noisily; or a turkey-cock half dead of starvation may strut and exhibit his fine plumage more proudly than ever, but each of those animals very soon relapses into its former condition."*

This is somewhat in accordance with the Darwinian theory; but whether the doctrine be true in general or not, it will be found in due time to be but too true in regard to our transmigrating insurance companies. By this, however, we would not be understood to mean that all companies that have absorbed soulless companies are without souls themselves. To this, as to most other rules, there are exceptions. Darwin tells us that a vigorous member of a family occasionally takes a weaker member under his protection, and succeeds in lengthening his existence in the struggle for life, but that he rarely, if ever, succeeds in making him a permanent type.

Without pausing here to decide this point, we will turn to the other side of the picture. And what change do we find? It is now ten years since we maintained that, of all the companies then in existence, not more than one out of every ten could be regarded as worthy of public confidence; in other words, we maintained that among the whole number not more than a dozen companies could be relied upon for their strength, permanency, and honesty. This dozen we mentioned at the time. Not one of these has passed out of existence, or seems likely to do so; not more than one or two have proved, in their dealings with their policy-holders, unworthy of the estimate we then gave of them. There is not one of the remaining ten of which it can be justly said that it has deprived the widow or the orphan of one dollar which it was legitimately and fairly bound to pay one or the other. The principles which these companies enunciated ten years ago as the basis of their action are the principles which they enunciate to-day. If any have changed their course towards their policy-holders, the change has been for the better; the general result to all has been a decided improvement. We place the reports of two at the head of this article for the purpose of quoting from them, not because the companies which make them—though unsurpassed in excellence—are better than the others, but because they discuss the subject of insurance more fully—because the views they put forward and the precepts they inculcate, are also those—with very little, if any, modification—of the other companies of their class. This will become sufficiently evident as we proceed. Thus, take as an illustration the views of the New England Mutual on the surrender values of policies:

---

* *Purana*, xvii. v. 2001, et seq.

> **"An absolute surrender can be made of the policy only in cases when the persons interested can assign their rights to the Company. A person who has insured *for his own benefit* has at any time the right of surrender, and even where the policy is for the benefit of a wife the Company will accept *the joint receipt of a husband and wife* in full discharge of their interest. But when a policy has been made for the benefit of *minor children*, it cannot be surrendered upon any terms. This subject is now alluded to, that persons at a distance from the home office who transact their business through agents, or by correspondence with the officers of the Company, may understand the full bearing of a contract made with the Company by them *for the benefit of wives and children.*"—Page 12.**

This is straightforward and just, but it is equally applicable to the Manhattan Life, the Phœnix Mutual, the Equitable, and several other companies of this honorable class, which we could mention. The powers and privileges conferred on agents and sub-agents by the New England Mutual, will also be found to be almost identical with those of all other companies, that mean to be honest and to continue stable Thus the directors proceed:—

> **"It being taken for granted that the applicant for insurance can read, write, and think, it becomes important for the agent, or solicitor, in accepting an application, and the applicant himself to know that what has been signed and witnessed is a *warranty* to the Company that the facts therein stated, upon which the Company is to issue its contract, is *absolutely* true. It is not a mere *representation* of facts, to the best of the applicant's knowledge, but a clear, distinct avowal that the Company is possessed of all the information that can possibly be had. If a fact is mis-**

stated or concealed, the Company assumes a risk when it insures upon such an application, for which the rate of premium chargeable to a person in ordinary health will not afford due compensation. If an applicant should omit to state so unimportant a fact to him as that he had not within a certain period employed a physician, he thereby *warrants* the truth of his statement, even though the disease for which he was treated may not have any bearing upon the acceptance or rejection of the risk. A person of ordinary business habits, who knows that what he puts his hand to he must stand by, *has no conception of the danger he runs when he conceals or misstates any fact in an application for life insurance. Such an act is sure not only to imperil the existence of the policy, but may bring want upon innocent parties for whose benefit the premiums have been paid.*"

Had those companies which have either given up the ghost altogether, or transmigrated, pursued this honest course, they might have possessed an independent existence to-day, since the companies which do so—such as the Knickerbocker, the New York Continental, the New York National, the Guardian, the North America and United States, etc.—prove their vitality even while they seem most assailed by difficulties. It is pleasant to add that in the same report we have a new illustration of the adage "honesty is the best policy," thus:—

> **"The Company has *paid out the past year* upon two hundred and twenty-three policies, the sum of $670,283.00, and there are falling due within the next sixty days $102,730.00 upon thirty-nine policies, making a total of $773,013.00 upon two hundred and sixty-two policies, against $875,315.00 upon two hundred and seventy-two policies, in the year preceding. There have also been paid $33,100.00 upon fourteen matured endowments, against $36,000.00 upon nine policies, in 1871. The total amount *paid in* 1872, *is* $806,113.00 against $911,315.00 in 1871."**

No one who reflects can fail to regard as a beneficent institution one which has paid such sums to widows and orphans within the two past years; and yet, as we shall see presently, there are several other companies that have adduced arguments equally solid and noble in favor of life insurance.

But first let us turn for a moment to the report of the president of the Mutual Benefit. More than once we have compared the reports of this gentleman with those of the president of the New England Mutual. In each we are always sure to find sound, honest thoughts on life insurance. Mr. Grover as well as Mr. Stevens gives us many such on the present occasion. That the following is of this character will be readily admitted, especially by editors:

> **"Experience and observation show that the purest minds need often to be 'stirred up by way of remembrance.' What seems to some the plainest and most easily remembered truths, are obscure and most easily forgotten by others. It is a conceded fact that it is only by 'line upon line and precept upon precept' that *the best of human beings are kept in the path of duty.*"**

Still truer is this of "the worst of human beings." We could mention quite a score of presidents whom no amount of lines or precepts could keep in the path of duty—presidents who hate lines and precepts, except those in their praise, as much as Satan is said to hate holy water, or as much as the provost of the University of Pennsylvania hates Latin! But Mr. Grover by no means forgets this interesting class. After showing the large increase of mortality during the past year, and its chief causes, he proceeds:

> "There is reason to believe that when the experience of the life companies for the year is collected, it will furnish the *strongest argument against the proposition recently made to reduce the premium rate on life policies;* a subject which so greatly excited the insurance interest a short time since. Certainly no company or association of companies in this country has had the experience necessary *to make so radical a change.*"

But this is not all. Mr. Grover first shows very truly what the Mutual Benefit has been doing since its organization for its policy holders; then he points out certain things which it has not done, thus:—

> "None of its assets were invested in *hazardous or speculative securities. No Director or Officer was allowed to receive commissions on business or loans, nor have any of them acquired wealth in its service.* The Association has acted as a kind and faithful friend *rather than a rigid and exacting task-master.*"

This seems to show that Mr. Grover has not before his eyes the fear of libel suits. But gentlemen of the bar are not generally a timid race. Besides, we believe, there is no Bastile at Newark—no "sponging house." The little State of New Jersey may be mocked at as out of the Union, but she clings to no institution abolished in all the principal monarchical countries of Europe more than a century ago. Doubtless Mr. Grover feels perfectly safe, therefore, in giving free expression to his opinions.

We may remark in passing, that were we vindictive we should rather thank, than blame, Mr. Winston for his libel suits. This all our insurance readers know; but our readers in general are not aware that for the many years during which the editor of the Insurance Times was the henchman and special champion of Mr. Winston and the Mutual Life, none were more grossly abused by him than we. The slightest criticism on either the president or his company was sure to bring on our head a torrent of the vilest abuse, precisely such as we have received from the quack doctors, and from the worthy organs of superstition, bigotry and intolerance. Not only would the gentleman now in our New York Bastile throw all sorts of filth at us with his own hand to please those whom we had criticised, but also make his paper the vehicle of the similar garbage heaped up by others. Thus, for example, a sort of sheet got up by the Traveller's Insurance Company, exactly on the plan of the similar sheets of the quack doctors and manufacturers of patent medicines, would contain a column of such low abuse of us as a decent fish-woman would blush to own as illustrative of her vocabulary. Several copies of this were sent to our office duly marked ; the same thing was scattered broadcast in the railway cars, stations, etc. Lest all this might not be enough, he who was so long the ardent admirer and zealous champion—not to say the hired bully—of Mr. Winston, and who now avows a much worse opinion of him than we ever entertained or expressed, would copy the whole thing into his paper!

To this day we have never condescended to make any reply to his attacks, or to any such. But we think it is sufficiently clear that were we spiteful we should regard the course of Mr. Winston only as a manifestation of retributive justice, especially as—so far as we are aware—he has never interfered in any manner with ourselves. Mr. Winston has certainly never threatened us. It is true, upon the other hand, that we have never for one moment entertained any malice against him. When editors criticise, there are always those who will say that it is because they have not got patronage; because their "little bill" has not been paid, etc. But the Mutual Life was the first of all insurance companies to patronize the National Quarterly. We found fault with some of the calculations of the Mutual on "the expectation of life"; and its huge advertisement was withdrawn. That it had a perfect right to withdraw we have never denied; and since we have never to this day called on its president; never spoken to him on any subject; since, so far as we are aware, he has never treated us with any discourtesy, there has been no reason, at any time, why we should speak of himself or his company otherwise than, as we thought, fairly and justly. Nor have we ever done so, however severe we may have seemed on some occasions.

We have said that, far from threatening or insulting us, Mr. Winston has never treated us with the slightest incivility; and we may add that none of his colleagues have treated us differently. But could we say the same of all underwriters whom we have criticised? There are several companies now extinct whose officers have threatened us again and again, in every way; but our readers know whether it is likely that any of them have ever succeeded in frightening us. We understood all about the Bastile three months ago, nay, ten years ago, just as well as we do now. But we were equally familiar with the fact that a large proportion of the world's most eminent thinkers, philosophers, poets, and scientific discoverers, as well as editors and critics, have been inmates of still worse dungeons. Nor can we accuse the president of the Mutual Life of any marked proneness to libel suits, since one swallow makes no summer, even though it be a very noisy swallow—one that makes a greater fuss than a dozen of discreet, sensible swallows. We can hardly be said, therefore, to be merely selfish in inviting the earnest attention of those of our readers who have power and influence to our Ludlow street Bastile, since as long as it exists there is no one so rich or so scrupulously upright—let his business be what it may—that he can say he may not one day find himself immured within its walls. For be it remembered that editors are liable to be placed there only in common with men of any other profession or calling, who may be required to give security for a larger amount of money than their friends may be able or willing to become their sureties for. Thus the institution is not only a satire on our boasted liberty of the press and freedom of thought; it is a satire on the right which every man is supposed to have in this country, to the enjoyment of his personal liberty until he shall have been proved guilty of crime by due process of law.

But there is another view of such cases as the particular one referred to. Who will say that Mr. Winston has done himself, or the Mutual Life, any good by his eight libel suits against his former retainer and champion? Does any one think the more highly of president, or company, on account of them? Is it likely that any one will, when all are brought to an issue, if they ever are? Supposing that a verdict were obtained to-morrow in favor of the Mutual Life and its president—a contingency not in the least probable—would it not be dearly bought? Would it not prove the most useless of all the "whitewashing processes" ever attempted by Mr. Winston? for the American people have far too much generosity not to frown grimly on those who, having a giant's strength (especially in the form of wealth), use it like a giant in oppressing the weak!

Be this as it may, we think the course of the other companies mentioned above in the same category with the New England Mutual and the Mutual Benefit, is much more compatible with the benevolent object and tendency of life insurance. This is eminently true, for example, of that of the Manhattan Life. The officers of this company engage in no quarrels. They indulge in no "hazardous or speculative securities;" neither do they "receive commissions," or acquire wealth at the expense of the policy holders. Yet they, too, are attacked by certain writers; but they do not deem it necessary to institute any libel suits to vindicate their character. They let the fruits of their labors vindicate them—such fruits as the foflowing taken from their last annual statement:

Gross Assets, January 1, 1873		**$8,341,154 92**
Reserve required for all policies in force	**$6,356,936 68**	
Claims by death, not yet due	**210,947 00**	
Dividends unpaid and all other liability	**207,037 43**	
		6,774,921 11
Undivided Surplus		**$1,566,233 81**

We venture to predict that no part of this surplus will be used for any "white-washing" purpose—either to execute vengeance on anybody, or to make black seem white! To do so were to contradict the following well-known characteristics of the company: "Prudence and skill in administration," "Justice and liberality in the payment of all losses and dividends," "Even and uninterrupted success in its operations from the very beginning."

We believe that even our enemies, if we really have any such, do not accuse us of being superstitious; and yet we think that honesty, integrity, and benevolence are inherited even by corporations—at least by insurance companies. And in proof of the fact we refer to the character of the New York National, whose president and vice-president qualified themselves for their present position as the efficient and successful agents of the Manhattan. The National has never made any fuss, or indulged in any clap-trap. It has had to struggle against the prejudices excited by the conduct of companies of a very different character, some of which no longer exist; but it is pleasant to add that there is now ample evidence that the success of the company is no longer a matter of doubt. This seems to be everywhere acknowledged. We cannot give our readers a more correct idea of its present status than by quoting the following extract from an article in a recent number of the Baltimore Underwriter and National Economist, a journal which deservedly enjoys a high character for ability and honesty:

> **"This excellent company has nearly completed the tenth year of its work in the good cause in which it is engaged. In striving for business alongside of older and larger companies, it has encountered up-hill work, but in contending *with the evils of reckless competition*, its progress has been most seriously interfered with.**

> Under the steady management of its admirable leader, Mr. E. A. Jones, however, it is emerging into the broad sunshine. The assets, freed from all items not available, are set down at $827,744, and the liabilities, which, a year ago, were stated to be $806,665, *have been reduced to* $664,488. We are glad to note that the Company has adopted measures for conducting its business according to the improved methods of growing experience, and thus *strengthening its position and presenting a clear balance sheet.*"

This is more than could be said of those understood to be the offspring of companies like the Mutual Life. Take, for example, the Widows and Orphan's Benefit, which we so often criticised, and which no longer exists, even in a state of amalgamation. We are not aware that the Universal,—said to be another offshoot,—has yet amalgamated, or transmigrated, but we should not be much surprised at receiving that intelligence before a very long period.

Nor do the offspring of the New York Life seem endowed with any more vitality; but rather less, if possible. They also are too much like Romeo's poor apothecary—the world is not their friend, nor the world's law! The Globe Mutual is nothing the better, we fear, for having obtained its president from the New York Life. For our own part we should have had much more confidence in that functionary had he come from the old Knickerbocker, from the Equitable, or from the Continental—that is, supposing that decrepid age could, by some *lusus naturæ*, be the descendant of vigorous, progressive age.

Yet the Globe, too, has had a little one or two—untimely births—such as the Protection Mutual, combined, if we remember correctly, with the Widows' and Orphans' Benefit, to form the Reserve Mutual, which in turn has had to pass into the bosom of the Guardian Life to save itself from annihilation. But the policy-holders of the defunct concerns may regard this as the end of their difficulties. Whatever those who consider the funds of insurance companies legitimate plunder may choose to say of the Guardian, it has always dealt fairly and liberally with its policy-holders; and it was never in a better condition to meet all lawful claims on its treasury than it is now, with its assets of nearly four millions, and its surplus above all liabilities of $213,167.13. There are some people who do more good during the last few hours of their life than they had done during as many dozens of years previously, and we think the fact is true of the ghosts of the Protection, the Widows' and Orphans' Benefit, and the Reserve Mutual, since they secured for their policy-holders the characteristic, watchful care of the Guardian Life.

Although we were sorry for the retirement of Mr. Lyman from the management of the Knickerbocker—having long regarded that gentleman as one of our ablest and most intelligent underwriters—we have seen no reason, on due reflection, to abate in the slightest degree our ancient abiding faith in that institution. When Mr. Lyman is sufficiently recovered in health, we should certainly like to see him at the head of some solid company, for there are so few who thoroughly understand the principles of life insurance, and who combine with their experience and knowledge so many of those qualities which give the intercourse between man and man its chief zest, altogether independently of dollars and cents, that the cultivated honest portion of the underwriting fraternity cannot afford the loss of such a man as a member of their guild. But, in the meantime, we are glad to see that the course of the old Knickerbocker is unequivocally onward. Until recently we had not the pleasure of knowing its new president personally. We, therefore, expressed no opinion as to his qualifications or fitness for so important a position. But Mr. Stanton is not merely a man of large wealth whose word is a bond; he has also a thorough knowledge of insurance from his long connection wlth the Knickerbocker, both as a director and vice-president; and what is, perhaps, still better, he is devoted to life insurance, in the spirit of the true philanthropist, for the good it does. As for the present vice-president, there is no underwriter whom we know better, or of whose qualifications we entertain a higher opinion. In short, Mr. Nichols occupies the first rank, both intellectually and morally, among American underwriters. And what the secretary of the Knickerbocker is—the gentleman who has occupied that position since the organization of the company—we need not say. It is sufficient to inform all whom the fact concerns, that he is still at his desk as ready and willing as ever to countersign the check of the widow or the orphan. But we will allow some of its figures to speak for the Knickerbocker:—

Net Assets, January 1, 1872		**$6,726,047.79**
Income, 1872:		
From Premiums	**$2,731,083.42**	
From Interest and Rents	**426,028.34**	**3,157,111.76**
		$9,883,159.55
Paid Death Claims	**$867,954.73**	
Paid Matured Endowments, Dividends, Surrendered and Lapsed Policies	**1,568,650.87**	
Total *Paid Policy-holders*	**$2,436,605.60**	
Net Assets, January 1, 1873		**$7,064,137.67**
Gross Assets, January 1, 1873		**8,099,890.90**
Surplus		**1,048,493.23**

No intelligent policy-holder could wish for a more encouraging record than this; and we do not hesitate to predict, from present appearances, and from other data before us, that the record for 1873 will prove still better.

It is but rarely, however, that a company continues to make progress after the retirement of its presiding officer, whether his retirement be caused by sickness or death. Only one instance more occurs to us at this momemt; we allude to the case of the New York Continental, which, as we shall presently show, has not been retarded in the least in its remarkable, solid progress by the death of a president who had no superior anywhere in all the qualifications that constitute an able and faithful underwriter. But that the rule is as we say may be easily proved. Take the Metropolitan, for example. This company owes its origin to the bright, keen underwriter who has also established the National, which he still guides, as shown above. On this gentleman's retirement from what may be called the germ of the Metropolitan, a certain doctor came into power in his place; but his doctoring had only the effect of turning a healthy subject into an invalid, until finally the doctor himself grew sick and died. He was succeeded by a gentleman who combined the accomplishments of a Sunday-school class leader with those of a manufacturer of flashy pictures. What the actual results are which the third president has produced we will not undertake to say. That we leave our readers to judge from the large "assets" which he displays in his last annual statement. We have not room for all the items of this wonderful, sworn document; we can only extract one:

Furniture, safes, and *agency material*................................ $34,429 01

What the "agency material" may be, is one of the many things of which we are ignorant. We are informed that it includes some expensive "cuts." Be this as it may, we must confess that we should be rather unwilling to rank this class of "assets" among the "available," except we happened to have creditors obliging enough to be satisfied with one dollar for every thirty due to them.

But the Metropolitan has, we believe, lost all its former officers, whereas the Knickerbocker and Continental have only lost one each. In other words the former has exchanged its old lamps for new lamps, as in the story of Aladin, whereas the two latter have each received an old lamp in exchange for an old lamp. At the Continental office, as well as at the Knickerbocker office, the good old secretary still remains. So does the good old vice-president. Mr. Rogers and Mr. Wynkoop are a tower of strength in themselves. Then who is Mr. L. W. Frost, the new president of the Continental? He is just such a man as Mr. John A. Nichols, the present vice-president of the Knickerbocker. The two are alike, not only in intelligence, shrewdness and energy, as underwriters; they are alike as to their previous relations to their respective companies. As one was a capital general agent so was the other; as one had contributed much to the resources and solidity of his company, so had the other. Accordingly as the Knickerbocker continues to increase its facilities for doing good so does the Continental; a fact sufficiently illustrated by the following figures:—

Number of Policies issued to January 1, 1873	44,580
Number of Policies issued in 1872	12,010
Assets, January 1, 1873	$6,059,201

Thus only two of all our companies have issued more policies in 1872 than the Continental, and the excess, even of that which has issued the largest number—the great Equitable Life—is less than a hundred policies.

Formerly our opinion of the North American Life was not favorable, and our readers know that, as long as we entertained that opinion, we did not speak favorably of it. The truth of the matter is, we were led to believe that that company oppressed those on whose houses it held mortgages by suddenly demanding the amount of the mortgage when such a demand was least expected, and it was most difficult, or impossible, to meet it. First we regarded this as incredible, its president having been one of the first of our underwriters whose course we regarded as commendable; for, while Mr. Morgan was the president of the Manhattan, we knew no more judicious, upright and faithful officer. But one after another assured us that the mortgage business of the North America was, for the reasons above mentioned, such as ought to bring discredit on any company, until we could not help believing that there must be some truth in the charge. Hence our criticisms; but by mere accident we were presented an opportunity of putting it to the test, and it is but simple justice to say that never have we tested any one more utterly unfounded. Quite a considerable number on whose houses the North America has held mortgages have assured us that no officers or business men could have dealt with them more gently, or more generously, than President Morgan and Vice-President Merrill; and we can now bear similar testimony ourselves from personal experience. It affords us sincere pleasure, therefore, to see that there are many evidences of the increasing prosperity of the North America. Its plan of issuing New York State registered policies, which are secured by pledge of public stocks, like the circulation of national banks, places it in the first rank among those companies on whose checks the widow and the orphan may rely in the hour of need.

As for the Equitable it has grown truly gigantic; it has already attained that high position which we have often predicted for it as the goal to which it was rapidly tending from the outset. During the past year it has issued more policies than any other company. Its assets now amount to nearly twenty millions ($19,695.053), and its income approximates closely to eight millions and a half ($8.420,044). These are grand results. Yet who can say that they have made the principal manager of the Equitable, or any of his colleagues, overbearing, or purse-proud? Mr. Hyde, too, and his company have been assailed. Grave charges have been made against both without the slightest foundation; but we have not heard that any one has been incarcerated or arrested for them. The officers of that company have, it seems, come to the wise and correct conclusion that they need no violent means—no sheriffs, no "sponging-houses," no jury verdicts—to convince the American people that they are honest and honorable men.

This time we seem to have forgotten the underwriters of Hartford, but it is not so. There are no better anywhere than certain members of the guild, who make that handsome, wealthy, polite city their home. We are reminded of these gentlemen now, by the United States Life, whose president has had important relations with them, and who possesses some of their sterling qualities. These qualities have enabled Mr. De Witt to increase the strength and power of the United States Life very considerably. Its prestige is very different to-day from what it was when that gentleman took charge of it. At the same time, he has yet much to learn from his Hartford friends. The officers of the Phœnix are not fitful, or hesitating in their progress; it is forward they look, not behind. They don't think half as much of what Mrs. Grundy says, as they do of what they think and *believe* themselves, even when Mrs. Grundy has become very rich, and assumed a threatening aspect. In short, they mind their own business, and that only, and will turn out of their way for nobody without solid reasons of their own for doing so. The United States Life is certainly a good, safe company, and its president is an honest man; we only think that the interests of both, as well as those of their policy-holders would be consulted by the adoption from the Phœnix gentlemen, of some of those additional qualities which we have pointed out. In the meantime the Phœnix now stands confessedly at the head of all the Hartford companies, in the strong hold which it has gained on the public confidence. In illustration of this, we take pleasure in presenting those of our readers interested in life insurance, the following items from its last annual statement:—

POLICIES ISSUED, 1827, 10,572. INCOME, 1872, $3,413,752.45.

Assets, securely invested	$8,209,325 07
Surplus, free of all liabilities	1,199,831 50
Dividends, paid to policy-holders during the year	943,441 71
Income for the year	3,413,752 45
Losses paid during the year	831,116 32

Neither the Ætna Life, nor the Connecticut Mutual presents any such results as these for the year. It is true that both these companies make a large display of assets; but to us those assets do not seem exactly the right kind. Thus, for example, the Ætna exhibits such items as the following:

Furniture of office, including agencies	$13,693 35
Obligatons for capital stock	46,944 00

It will be admitted, that nearly fourteen thousand dollars would purchase a handsome amount of furniture. Then, if only in use one month, how much would it bring? Is the Ætna furniture really worth more than $5,000 at this moment? That is, would it bring more if sold to the highest bidder under the hammer? We think not. We will not say that the rest of the Ætna assets are equally exaggerated; but we are sorry to think that that company has rather degenerated.

It is otherwise, however, with the Charter Oak. This company has one of the most magnificent insurance palaces in the world; nor do we know of any insurance palace in Europe or America more elegantly furnished. But what is the estimate set upon its furniture by Mr. Walkley? It is the following:

Furniture, safes and fixtures.	$9,254 32

This is quite a difference. In our opinion, the Charter Oak furniture is better worth $14,000 than the Ætna furniture is worth $9,000. This is of little importance, except so far as it shows how differently some people will estimate their goods from the manner in which others estimate theirs. We remember the time when the Ætna *figured* in a different way. Then we used to contrast its figuring with that of the Traveller in regard to its "pictures." But where shall we find a contrast now, except among those companies which include their breeches and night-caps among their assets?

Be this as it may, we think that with the exceptions mentioned as such the Hartford companies are retrograding instead of advancing. Those interested in denying this will doubtless say that we commend our favorites only because they are our favorites. But let those whose interest it is only to ascertain the truth, compare the various Hartford companies' own annual statements with each other, especially in regard to their assets, and to the number of policies issued within the last two years, and then ask themselves whether our favoritism be not founded on straightforward honesty, truth, and justice. If these researches be not entirely satisfactory let the officers of the different companies be compared with each other. What names of underwriters inspire more confidence among those who know them, in Hartford or elsewhere, than Fessenden, Walkley, Burns? Will those sagacious, disinterested, and incorruptible Hartford editors, who, as the champions of the Hartford shams, occasionally abuse us, be kind enough to answer this question as soon as convenient. We shall have no particular objection if, by way of condiment, they add a little scurrility, call us a few hard names, etc.

It is a curious fact that the life companies of Pennsylvania are, with one or two exceptions, as much inferior to those of New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts, as the University of Pennsylvania is to the universities, and colleges of those States. This is something like a phenomenon; but we cannot close our eyes to it. That it does not arise from lack of intelligence, or lack of honesty on the part of Pennsylvanians, none admit more readily than we. Indeed, it is precisely because the Pennsylvanians are a good-natured, well-disposed people that it is so comparatively easy to induce them, by means of fair speeches and fine promises (even when both are in "broken English") to accept brass for gold.

For the present, however, we will abstain from criticising Pennsylvania companies. We can assure all whom it may concern, that we have never done so but with sincere reluctance; and our feeling in that respect has undergone no change. It is much more agreeable to us to praise than to censure, when we can do the former justly; and, in proof of the fact, we most cheerfully inform our readers that the twenty-third annual statement of the American Life Insurance Company of Philadelphia is a very satisfactory and creditable document. In order that our readers may be able to form an opinion of their own as to the correctness or incorrectness of this estimate, we extract the following facts and figures, from the official paper before us:

RECEIPTS FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1872.

Premiums received during the year	$1,172,654 41
Interest received from Investments and Rents	230,781 28
	$1,403,435 69
Assets, January 1, 1873	$3,985,111 58

These figures form a good record, especially as their truthfulness is attested by such names, among the trustees of the American Life, as J. Edgar Thompson, the great railroad king; James Pollock, ex-governor of Pennsylvania; John Wanamaker, merchant prince, etc. In a word, this company, while under the guidance of so enlightened and judicious a presiding officer as Mr. George W. Hill, may well be regarded as an honorable exception to the general character of Philadelphia life insurance companies, and as a proof that the right materials exist in that good city if they are only made available.

INDEX

TO THE

TWENTY-SIXTH VOLUME

OF THE

NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Art, Development in, article on, 132 *et seq.*—never a linear but spiral growth, 133—the Athenian age, 134—Greek architecture, 135—Corinthian, 136—Gothic, *ib.*—Classic and Christian architecture compared, 137—ancient and modern sculpture, 138—difference between the schools of art, 139—ancient painting, *ib.*—the modern painter, *ib.*—Italy the battle-ground, 140—Michael Angelo and Raphael, 141—chivalry the flower of the middle ages, 142—the "new departure" of the human race, *ib.*—the phases of love, 143—these characterized, *ib.*—the life of Christ the dividing line, 144—Greek poetry described, 145—compared with modern, 146 *et seq.*—Keat's description of a wave breaking at sea, 148—selections from "Elegy on Adonis" *ib.* *et* 149—the spirit of modern verse, *ib.*—extract from Milton's Lycidas, 150—ancient conception of Deity, 151 *et seq.*—Christian conception, 153.

Asbury, Francis, character and career of, noticed, 187, *et seq.*

Autology, a system of mental science, noticed, 396 *et seq.*

Birds of New England and Adjacent States, the, noticed, 400 *et seq.*

Choate, Rufus, article on, 26, *et seq.*—from a product of civilization, 26—oratory the great instrument to control and carry on society, 27—American orators, *ib.*—pulpit oratory, *ib.*—the lawyer's profession, 28—Choate at the head of the New England bar, 29—graduated at Dartmouth, *ib.*—began practice in his native country, 30—his severe struggles, *ib.*—his skill in the examination of witnesses, 31—his power over jurors, *ib.*—Choate and Erskine compared, 32—his style, 33—his oratory, 34—Choate and Webster compared, *ib.*—Choate as a scholar, 35—his eulogium upon Webster, *ib.*—his love of reading, 36—his address upon the eloquence of revolutionary periods, 37—his course in the senate, 38—a man to be studied, 39—the foundation of his fame, 40—his manner of preparation, 41—his personal relations, 42.

Exodus, Desert of, reviewed, 183, *et seq.*

Fire of the Earth, Internal and External, article on, 353—" the authority of a word," *ib.*—the story of science. 354—the nebular hypothesis, *ib. et seq.*—M. Poisson's theory, 355—the precession of the equinoxes, 356—Mr. Hopkins's hypothesis, 357—observations on the earth's temperature, 358 *et seq.*—the molten nucleus hypothesis, *ib. et seq.*—nature not limited in time, 360—igneous forces, 361—mountain formation, 362 *et seq.*—mountain masses once at the bottom of seas, 364—De Conte's conclusion, 365—fissure eruptions, 366—the unstableness of the crust of the globe, 367—Scandinavia, *ib.*—Greenland, 368—earthquakes, 369—in Jamaica, 370—in Peru. 371—in Lisbon, *ib. et seq.*—in Calabria, 373—recent earthquakes, 374—in Caraccas, 375—in Chile, 376—boundaries of volcanic regions, 377—Cotopaxi. *ib.*—volcanoes in North America, 378—Vesuvius, 379 *et seq.*—Geysers, 380—influence of earthquakes and volcanoes, 381.

Geographies, School, Cornell's series of, reviewed and criticised, 166 *et seq.*

Geometry and Trigonometry, Elements of, noticed, 182.

Goethe, his life and works, noticed, 186 *et seq.*

Grammar, English, an introduction to the study of, reviewed and criticised, 178 *et seq.*

Grammar, German, first book in, noticed, 176—Elements of, *ib.*

Greeley, Horace, article on, 153 *et seq.*—our great men beheld from a distance, *ib.*—magnetic men, 154—Mr. Greeley a fireside guest, *ib.*—his personal powers as a journalist, *ib.*—Bennett, Raymond and Greeley compared, 155—the secret of Mr. Greeley's power, 156—his qualifications for overturning ancient wrongs, 157—distinguished by the aptness of the weapons, *ib.*—his character, "sweetness and light," 158—conservative element in his nature, 159—a consistent man, 160—his hatred of slavery, 161—a characteristic letter, *ib.*—his weakness a craving for appreciation, 162—his mistake, 163—his candidacy a weak one, 164—his life a success, 165—its tragic close, *ib.*—"it is done," 166.

Guyot's Geographies, reviewed and criticised, 382.

How the Kingdom come to Little Joy, noticed, 394 *et seq.*

Instruments, Musical, an essay on, noticed, 195.

Jean Baptiste de la Salle, article on, 275 *et seq.*—editorial preface, *ib. et seq.*—one word more of Roderick Borgia, 276—a Catholic organ and holy water, 277—note, *ib.*—Christian Brothers and Jesuits contrasted, 278 *et seq.*—too strong a dose, 279—Christian Brothers never persecutors, 280—reasons for presenting the article, *ib.*—a scrap of church language, 281—author's introduction, *ib.*—the consoling study of the lives of noble men, *ib.*—La Salle one of these, *ib.*—his birth and early education, 282—a priest at twenty-seven, 283—his early conviction of the faulty methods of instruction, 284—his first efforts calumniated and sneered at by priests, 285—his self-sacrificing conduct, 286—his life-work the education of youth in France *ib.*—normal schools for district teachers, 288—they survive the Revolution 289—the Christian Brothers approved by Pope Benediet XIII., *ib.*—the wisdom of La Salle's regulations, 291—the causes of the success of his institute, *ib.*—work in America. 292—no mixing with politicians, 293—understanding of the wants of the people, 294—reasons for conducting schools of the higher class, 295 *et seq.*—Manhattan college, 297—editorial note, *ib. et seq.*—secular help, 299—reasons for it. 300 *et seq.*—"they write no books," 303—religion and science, conclusion, 304.

Journal, Britton's, noticed, 194.

Literature, American, the Puffing Element in, article on, 42 *et seq.*—Porson and Hart contrasted, 43—Mr. Hart's idea of literature, *ib.*—the author on himself, 44 *et seq.*—stands alone in this respect, *ib. et seq.*—his Prayers, 45—complimentary copies and complimentary letters, 46—testimonials, *ib.*—specimen puffs, 47—waterfalls, 48—specimen instruction to teachers, 49—the author's definition of American literature, 50—the mob of gentlemen who write, 51—spurious authors, 52—little known of the lives of the greatest authors, 53—the Hart pantheon, 54—Stauffer and Richardson, 55—Mr. Davidson as a critic, 56—the plastering process, 58—specimens of grammar, 60—beautiful lyrics, 62—Catholic authors huddled together, 63—omissions, 64 *et seq.*—reciprocal puffing. 65—Mr. Underwood's hand-book of English authors, 66.

Man, Primeval, noticed, 192 *et seq.*

North America before the Spanish Conquest, article on, 209 *et seq.*—new source of American history, *ib.*—researches of modern investigators, 210—European navigators prior to Columbus, 210 *et seq.*—Chinese intercourse with America, 211—the mound builders of oriental origin, 212—"the dark and bloody ground," 213—M. de Bourbourg's theory, 214 *et seq.*—intercourse between Ireland and coasts of America, 215—visited by the Northmen, 216—American inscriptions unexplained, 217—disappearance of archælogical objects, 218—the story of Madoc, 219—the great island, 220—religious practices of Indian tribes, 221—their condition upon the arrival of the Spaniards, *ib.*—the tribes and their distribution, 222 *et seq.*—the Five Nations, 223 *et seq.*—the Iroquois language of Asiatic origin, 226—estimated numbers of aborigines, 227 *et seq.*—normal condition of these tribes, 229—their traditions throw no light upon their origin, 229 *et seq.*—Roger Williams's theory, 231—their fate, 232.

On the Mountain, noticed, 394 *et seq.*

Oxford's Junior Speaker, noticed, 390 *et seq.*

Pope Alexander VI., article on, 105 *et seq.*—an editorial observation or two, *ib.*—respect for the popes in general, 106—Alexander VI. a hideous exception, *ib.*—not well for the Catholic church that he should be vindicated, *ib.*—Monks the chief reformers of the church, 107—the persecution of Savonarola, 108—Luther, *ib.*—the Catholic church not responsible for a Borgia, 109—author's vindication, *ib.*—Alexander VI. compared to Columbus, 110—the author's conversion, 111 *et seq.*—M. Chantrel's conversion to the cause of the pontiff, 112 *et seq.*—three classes of writers on the subject, 114—Guichardini and Paul Jove, 116—Tomaso Tomasi and John Burchardt, 117 *et seq.*—basis of the defence of Alexander, 121—his family relations defended, 124 *et seq.*—his adjudication between Spain and Portugal, 130—his connection with Columbus, 131—the greatest pope, the greatest saint, and the greatest genius, 132.

Reviews and Essays on Art, Literature and Science, noticed, 392 *et seq.*

Shakespeare, Motives and Struggles of, in settling in London, article on, 232 *et seq.*—popular conception of Shakespeare, 233—Shakespeare formatives, 234 *et seq.*—his age that of dramatic transformation, 235—the age the reason for the dramatist, 236—the Lucy feud, 237—his going to London a deliberate act, 238—reasons for adopting the drama, *ib.*—his first inventions lyrical, 239—his literary faculty balanced between the lyric and dramatic, 240—the drama when he entered London, 241—thirteen years before he emerges from the crowd, 242—seven years of struggle, 243—the sequence of his plays, 244—the key-note of Hamlet, 245—the popular myth of Shakespeare, 246 *et seq.*—did he originate a new method? 247 *et seq.*—conclusions, 249.

Siam and the Siamese, article on, 1 *et seq.*—the word Siam, *ib.*—the population of, 3—their religion Buddhism, *ib.*—as a people poorly educated, 5—Mrs. Leonowens governess to the king's children, *ib.*—her work as affording an insight into oriental court life, 6—polygamy in Siam, 8—Siamese households, 9—etiquette, 10—subordinate kingship, 11—Maha Mongkut, 12—fertility of Siam, 15—its geography, *ib.*—ancient edifices, 16—its history, 17 *et seq.*—its religion of Egyptian origin, 24 *et seq.*—its architectural remains, 25—its future, 26.

Theory, the Planetary, article on, 67 *et seq.*—the power of algebraic symbols, *ib.*—mathematical tables, 68—Hipparchus, 69—problems of Kepler, 70—aids to Newton, 71—his *Principia*, 72—Euler, the first to advance beyond Newton's theory, 73—the prize problem of the Academy of Sciences, 74—attempted solutions, 75—Euler's method explained, 76—the perturbation of the planets, 77—Lagrange's solution, 78—Laplace's solution, *ib.*—the same explained, 79—Poisson's theory, 81—Lagrange's memoir, 82—other methods, 83—conclusions stated, 86 *et seq.*—relation between the mass of Venus and the maximum eccentricity, 88.

University of Pennsylvania and its New Windows, article on, 88 *et seq.*—common opinion of critics, 89—the severest not wanting in good-nature, *ib.*—tribute to Quintilius, *ib.*—other critics cited, 90—delay in criticising this institution, *ib.*—a twofold motive therefor, 91—reasons for questioning its efficiency, *ib.*—a request to hear some of its recitations, 92—reply from the *Provost* and invitation to attend its exhibition, *ib.*—another note to Dr. Stille, 93—a similar reply, *ib.*—Latin note, *ib.*—remains unanswered, *ib.*—a paragraph from the fruitless missive, 94—the University's experience with a German traveller, 95—its rules and regulations, *ib.*—compared with Seton Hall and Fordham, *ib.*—with Yale and

Harvard, 96—its rank determined, 97—Philadelphia letters requesting an overhauling, 98 *et seq.*—the University's new windows, 101—model inauguration speech, 102—remarks on the same, *ib. et seq.*—other speeches, 103—suggestive lines from Goldsmith, 104—an appropriate inscription, 105.

University of Pennsylvania and its New Windows, Supplement to, 305—a venerable patient, *ib.*—an absurd physician, 306—only real quacks disturbed, 307—the storm upon the "Savage Quarterly," *ib.*—companions in the savage state, note, 308—a ludicrous incident, 309—the press besieged. 310—a reply from Gulliver, *ib.*—obstinate editors, 311 *et seq.*—the Latin affair again, 314—unsuccessful tactics, *ib.*—typographical errors, 315—anachronisms, *ib. et seq.*—passage from the first "vindication." 316 *et seq.*—a spur for a venerable hide, 318—the Bulletin's change of heart, 319 *et seq.*—ditto of the Inquirer, 321—an abundance of assaults, 322—Hall's cat, 323—Hall and Stillé, 324—Stillé's cat, 325—garbled Latin, *ib.*—*Cæsar criticised*, 326—the genuine epistle, 327—the same explained, 328—a challenge, note, *ib. et seq.*—the University of Göttingen, 329 *et seq.*—the Latin letter defended, 321 *et seq.*—the Inquirer's commentary, 333—a curious fact, note, *ib. et seq.*—begging, 335—enigma explained, 336—Prospectus of the University, *ib.*—its *equipment*, 337—note, *ib. et seq.*—the unfortunate Penn Monthly, 338—the provost's letter, 339 *et seq.*—comments on the same, 340 *et seq.*—a distinction without a difference, 341—a letter, and reply, 342—remarks on the latter, 343—comparison with Girard College, *ib.*—with Pennsylvania Insane Hospital, 344—with Bloomingdale, 345 *et seq.*—"Savage" disposition toward Pennsylvania, 347 *et seq.*—estimate of Sing Sing, 349—Pennsylvania railroads, 350—no friends lost by the "savage attack," *ib.*—the mendacious Teuton again, 351—Euripides explained, 352—an English motto for the University of Pennsylvania, 352.

World Wealth, article on, 250 *et seq.*—the circumstances which build nations, *ib.*—influence of Homer and Shakespeare, 251—the king a creature, *ib.*—national force, 252—origin of chieftainship, 253 *et seq.*—earliest mental movement, invention of language, 255—religion coeval with it, *ib.*—man's progress not *per saltum*, 256—world wealth, *ib.*—early acts, 257 *et seq.*—agriculture and architecture, 258—influence of the physical characteristics of a country, 259 *et seq.*—the conditions of human progress, 261—its order illustrated, 262 *et seq.*—payments of the principal nations into the world's treasury, 264—contributions of Greece, 265—of Rome, 266—of Christianity, 267—of Mohammedanism, *ib.*—ideas more force than facts. 268—career of Napoleon, 269—later sciences, 270—political economy, *ib.*—the present marked by constructive purposes, 271 *et seq.*—human fraternity; its grand idea, 272 *et seq.*

Zell's Descriptive Hand Atlas of the World, renewed, 38 *et seq.*

[illegible]